FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 221 17 November 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Studio 9' Program on Post-Reykjavik Situation [Zorin, Arbatov, Sagdeyev] AA 1
Falin Interview on Reykjavik [Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 10 Nov] AA 15

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Military Council Meeting Results Reported [IZVESTIYA 15 Nov] BB 1
Vietnam's Truong Chinh Departs From Moscow BB 1
Commentary Denies 'Conjecture' on CEMA Summit [Pasko] BB 2
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Assesses Results of CEMA [12 Nov] BB 3

WORLD & REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Kolchanov, Lebedev, Zholkver] CC 1
CSCE Delegate Criticizes U.S. Human Rights Record CC 8
AFP Version CC 8
Kola Missiles Withdrawal Cited [AFP] CC 9
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Cites Tatarnikov Speech [14 Nov] CC 10

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Continuing Comments on U.S. Arms to Iran A 1
'Growing Scandal' [Kalyagin, Dunayev] A 1
Dunayev: 'New Watergate' Shown A 2
PRAVDA Criticism [Gan, 15 Nov] A 3
IZVESTIYA Comments [Blinov, 15 Nov] A 4
Continued Contacts Criticized [Sheftunov] A 5
Kudrin Quotes Participants A 6
Turkatenko Views Aim of Sales A 8
Commentaries Hit U.S. Sanctions Against Syria A 9
Attempt to 'Distract Public' [Lapin] A 9
Kulik Raps U.S. 'Allegations' A 10
Reagan Signs National Defense Authorization Act A 11

CHINA

Chinese Acrobats Arrive in Leningrad 13 Nov B 1
Moscow Radio Notes Russian Art Show in PRC [Peace and Progress] B 1
Commentary Views Economic Cooperation With PRC [Ivanov, Peace and Progress] B 1
Moscow Radio Views PRC Industrial Project Aid [Peace and Progress] B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Visits Moscow C 1
Meets With Shevardnadze C 1
Holds Talks With Kapitsa C 2
'Broad Masses' Opposed to SDI Participation [Potapov] C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Shevardnadze Receives Bangladesh Envoy 11 Nov [PRAVDA 13 Nov] D 1
Shevardnadze Receives Indian Ambassador 11 Nov D 1
Talks, Protocol With Indian Minister Concluded D 2
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Views Service in Panjsher Valley [8 Nov] D 2

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further Reportage on Aliyev Talks in Vientiane E 1
Meets Cambodia's Heng Samrin E 1
Aliyev, Kaysone Hold Talks E 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Syria's Talas Receives General Ivanovskiy [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Nov] H 1
PRAVDA Comments on UK-U.S. 'Anti-Syrian Campaign' [Maslennikov, Glukhov, and Peresada, 12 Nov] H 1
New Envoy Appointed to Republic of Tunisia H 3
Zverev Replaces Akopov as Envoy to Kuwait H 3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Embassy in Maputo Denies Machel Black Box Pact [Luanda] J 1
Ambassador to Mauritania Replaced by Komogorov [PRAVDA 10 Nov] J 1
Briefs: Delegation Visits Tanzania J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Supreme Soviet Presidium Holds Session
Ratifies Accident Convention R 1
Reservation on Convention R 1
Leaders at Session R 2
Supreme Soviet Session Begins; Gorbachev Attends R 2
Sokolov Present at Session R 2
Agenda Confirmed R 3
Marchuk, Shalayev Speak R 3
Talyzin Delivers Report R 4
Gostev Speaks on Budget R 5
First Joint Session Ends [Vasilyeva] R 5
Separate Debates Begin R 6
Gorbachev Speaks on State Acceptance of Products [PRAVDA 16 Nov] R 6
Zaykov Addresses Meeting R 12
Demichev at Joint Meeting of Youth Commissions R 12

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Early November Weather, Crops Status Reported T 1
[Ignatova in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Nov]
Agricultural Developments for 11-14 Nov Reported T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

TASS Notes Cosmos, Molniya Satellite Launches U 1
Cosmos-1791 Nov 13 U 1
Cosmos-1792 Nov 13 U 1
Molniya-1 Nov 16 U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Leaders Receive Further GOSR Greetings
SRV Sends Greetings V 1
[IZVESTIYA 7 Oct]
DPRK Greets Ryzhkov V 2
[PRAVDA 9 Nov]
Lao Leaders Send Message V 3
[PRAVDA 9 Nov]
Ortega Greets Gorbachev V 4
[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]
Hasani Greets Gromyko V 5
[PRAVDA 9 Nov]

'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM ON POST-REYKJAVIK SITUATION

OW151111 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0630 GMT 15 Nov 86

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet Television and Radio, with Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of American and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Academician Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello comrades, we are meeting with you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center in order to discuss current world political problems. At the Studio 9 table today are leading Soviet scientists, Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Academician Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, Director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The importance of some political events becomes bigger instead of smaller with the passing of time. That is what is happening with the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik. Since Reykjavik, it has become evident that the world political agenda has practically changed, it is different now, with different points of reference and different criteria, as a result of what happened in the Icelandic capital and, at the same time, it becomes apparent that, on the other side, they are trying not to notice this, conducting affairs in the old way, moving along the old rut. It has been discovered that Washington not only tries to distort what was discussed in Reykjavik, but also tries, in the most substantial way, to distance itself from agreements reached there and to dismantle those agreements.

This became particularly manifest recently during the meeting between Comrade Shevardnadze, Soviet minister of foreign affairs, and Secretary of State Shultz in Vienna. In recent history, there have not been many precedents for a great power trying so quickly and so substantially to reject its own words and obligations. Georgiy Arkadyevich, why do you think this has happened.

[Arbatov] You know, I would begin with the simplest and most obvious things. In any business, like in this business -- that is the arms race -- some make a profit, and others a loss. But, as things stand in America, those who lose do not have much of a say. They can vote once every 2 years in the Congressional elections, and once every 4 years in the Presidential elections. Now those who profit, the military-industrial complex, -- there is no need to simplify matters, there are other things besides profits, like position in society and power -- depend directly on the arms race; their prosperity depends on little, or rather large, amounts of money from the taxpayers being used for the arms race.

I would say that this section of the U.S. ruling class has a Mafia-style organization; it has some kind of Mafia style. There, more than in any other section of U.S. business -- which has never been known for its high morals and manners -- we have bribery, intimidation, political blackmail, and so forth. But these are the first and most obvious things.

Then there are other things. You see, in Reykjavik the door was opened slightly and revealed a different world, a nuclear-free world. I am certain that this picture aroused a sigh of relief and raised high hopes among the majority of people on earth.

But there were people, politicians -- and I am disinclined to suspect all of them of very selfish and evil intentions -- with whom it may just be the inertia of thought, that very old way of thinking under which they simply cannot visualize any different life. They have grown as used to conditions as to some of their own birthmarks or warts. This frightened them. All of a sudden, we saw how the very same people who, theoretically, seemed to be in favor of a nuclear-free world and so forth, start retreating all of a sudden -- not only in America, but in Europe too.

[Sagdeyev] I have just returned from the United States, where I had an opportunity to observe the process of discussion after Reykjavik; to talk to many scientists and political leaders, and I have to say that many representatives of the U.S. community -- business circles, and political leaders, including those who are realistically minded with respect to the need for the detente and disarmament process -- strongly criticize the entire concept and all the preparations conducted by the Reagan team before Reykjavik. In conclusion, they think that Reykjavik has exposed, to a considerable extent, the adventurism of the present administration.

[Arbatov interrupts] The story most probably comes from the version: An old man with a weak memory, who makes mistakes, and who does not always grasp everything all at once went [to Reykjavik], and the insidious Russians took advantage of this. They used some of his slips of the tongue and mistakes, and attributed a version to him, and almost enticed him, dragged him into very nearly the trap which slammed shut. I have also heard this.

I have to tell you, I was told by a prominent American recently -- he did give me his name, and I did not ask for his name -- but one of the U.S. foreign policy officials who stayed at home said, on learning about the outcome of Reykjavik: Thank God that he -- that is the President -- did not sign anything. That was the reaction of a number of people. But it is simply not possible to accept this version. I already had to talk about this in one of the previous Studio 9 programs. REF OW151111 Moscow Television Service Russian 150630///Studio 9 programs

[Arbatov continues] That is incorrect. The Americans did not have the right and should not have come unprepared. There should have been no surprises for them. What the Soviet Union spoke about, what was contained in the three-page proposals, and what was later the subject of discussion between Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan was a direct continuation and the logical development of everything the Soviet Union had said in all channels -- in public, in correspondence with Reagan, at the level of foreign ministers, and at the talks during the entire past year, beginning with Comrade Gorbachev's January statement on the complete elimination of nuclear arms by the end of the current century. So it is absolute nonsense. They should have known what to expect and they should have been prepared. Nevertheless, I cannot exclude the possibility they were not prepared. And here arises the question: Why?

[Sagdeyev] I think that they have convinced themselves that everything we do is propaganda. And this is how they started with our moratorium on nuclear tests...

[Arbatov interrupts] That is correct.

[Sagdeyev] Later they understood that the moratorium was a serious proposal. And I remember that they even had a very interesting article about the moratorium apparently being a serious proposal. That means that things are bad for us.

[Arbatov interrupts] That was the article's headline, right?

[Sagdeyev] Yes.

[Arbatov] You know, I think there could be a second element. They could also have convinced themselves of something else. They started inventing the story that we have such domestic problems, such different views among the leadership, and they simply deceived themselves, convinced themselves that the Soviet Union could not come up with some kind of serious, far-reaching proposals on arms limitation.

Well, one has to pay for such miscalculations. After all, both the President and Shultz were of sound mind. And you know, speaking frankly, I feel somewhat sorry for Shultz. He is a respectable, elderly man. I first met him when Nixon was in power. He has a great biography, with great achievements in the business world and some achievements in politics.

I remember Shultz at his press conference immediately after Reykjavik. That was a tragic picture. It was evident that this man spoke with great pain about achievement being so close and then later turning out to be unattainable. It was an entirely different Shultz at his press conference after Vienna. It was no longer Shultz. He spoke there like Charles Wick, the chief of the United States propaganda agency, with cunning moves, efforts to confuse the agenda, to make the main item human rights -- although we are ready to discuss them too, and are ready to discuss more deeply than the U.S. is apparently ready to do now. Frankly I was offended at the way Reykjavik and the position of the Soviet Union was presented.

[Zorin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, what is the matter, why are they trying to dismantle the agreements reached in Reykjavik on the issues it was possible to agree on? Are they too unexpected and new and the United States is not ready for them, or are powerful forces in Washington, for which no agreements are suitable, responsible?

[Arbatov] I think that both causes are important. First there is the military-industrial complex, which is a very powerful section of the ruling class. So far, it knows how to defend its interests, forcing others to listen even when what it advocates is contrary to the interests of the entire ruling class. I would not be afraid to say that. You see, when we submitted our proposals in Reykjavik and earlier, when we first made proposals, we were not naive people. We understood that there would not be any agreement if what we propose is contrary to the interests of the United States -- the United States as it is now, not some future or ideal United States, but the United States with its ruling class, its system, all that we consider a reality -- and that meets the interests of the U.S. ruling class and without doubt meets the interests of U.S. society. Now that section, that very powerful section -- despite the fact that it is not the majority -- is today especially influential with the present administration. And here Comrade Gorbachev has called the administration a prisoner of the military-industrial complex, and that is correct. On the other hand, this administration is very close to the military-industrial complex ideologically and spiritually. And even geographically. The President comes from a region where these interests are very strong.

[Zorin] Reagan's political base is California, and 47 percent of military contracts for the 1983 to 1986 period have gone precisely to the military corporations in California. Apparently, much of what is happening in Washington now in attempting to retreat from Reykjavik, and that has become apparent in Vienna, can be traced to this.

[Arbatov] If you look around and study the various ties, this undoubtedly plays a large part, not precluding the President, a man with position, from either rising above this or not. To rise to the level of this position and to become a leader. This has happened on many occasions, and this is why we are very seriously talking with Reagan. This man must represent the American people and their interests. He is under pressure, and here lies the difficulty of politics.

[Zorin] I think the idea that the interests of the military-industrial complex are not necessarily the interests of the whole ruling class is a serious idea.

[Sagdeyev] I feel that we are simply observing this and witnessing this struggle between two trends within the ruling group -- between the military-industrial complex and those circles aspiring particularly to the development of trade relations with us. Recently, I visited a large organization in New York, which unites business circles, politicians, and scientists. I have in mind the New York Council.

[Arbatov] Of Foreign Relations.

[Sagdeyev] ... of Foreign Relations.

[Arbatov] One could say that this is the foreign relations elite of the U.S. East Coast.

[Sagdeyev] I was asked to speak about SDI and about our attitude to SDI, and then I was asked a question about the peaceful use of space, about joint flights and, in particular, about a manned flight to Mars. I said that the flight was expensive and it is doubtful that it could be realized in the near future, and someone who participated in this meeting, one of the American participants, made a caustic joke: What a pity! We would have offered Richard Perle to you for transportation to Mars. There was friendly laughter.

[Zorin] I would like to enlighten those viewers to whom the name Richard Perle means little. He is one of the superhawks in Washington, Weinberger's right-hand man, one of the inspirers of the Pentagon's hardest lines, and one of the most hawkishly inclined figures in Washington.

Gregoriy Arkadyevich, could it be that among those who have now spoken out against the radical decisions reached by the Soviet and American leaders in Reykjavik, are not only those who are ill-meaning people, but also those who are honestly mistaken? That among them are those who are quite sincerely frightened that these radical measures might cause harm to security, since it breaks the stereotype of the political thinking which has formed over the past 40 years.

[Arbatov] Certainly, people like that do exist. They certainly do exist because, really, over the past decade many in the West throught, and this belief was, and is being, artificially supported, that good or bad, we have lived for 40 years without a war because of the fear of a nuclear catastrophe. How then can we reject nuclear weapons?

First, I would say, I have doubts that we have lived for 40 years without a war because of nuclear weapons. Perhaps, Lady Luck can claim most of the credit for this. On many occasions, we approached the very edge of the abyss. Secondly, how would you react to the following conclusion?

An old man says to you: I have lived for 70 years and have not died once! That means that I will live for the next 70 years. You would answer: What about old age, decrepitude, and illness? But the processes that are taking place here are no less dangerous.

The very logic of the arms race is leading us to the brink, beyond which everything becomes uncontrollable, where catastrophe becomes quite feasible. These arms race dynamics, all those tendencies which are now acting in the world, could make the catastrophe inevitable. SDI is a shining example of this.

[Zorin] The following argument is often heard. Nuclear weapons would be liquidated, but conventional arms would remain, and then a war with conventional weapons would become more probable and perhaps even unavoidable.

[Arbatov] Well, first of all NATO, even now in the presence of nuclear weapons realizing that its use is suicidal, is already increasing its stake on so-called conventional arms. Now, an incomparably greater part of the funds is being spent, not on nuclear arms, but on those types of arms. Secondly, there is practically the same fear for conventional war as there is for nuclear war, and this is best understood in Europe. Therefore, the deterrent effect here for people who more or less understand what is happening, is the same. This is correct. I am not even speaking of the fact that the destructiveness of conventional weapons is becoming such that the difference between them and nuclear weapons is disappearing.

[Zorin interrupts] Conventional is just a conditional term.

[Arbatov] Yes, they are quite unconventional. There is however, another matter. Take Europe, for example. There are 150 nuclear reactors in Europe, or perhaps slightly more, similar to the one at Chernobyl. Just imagine that this reactor becomes a target for a conventional bombardment or artillery shelling. We, who have lived through the Chernobyl tragedy, and our neighbors who were startled by it, understand what this means. In a word, these are the facts.

It is precisely because of this, I feel, that it is very important to keep in mind that our policy is not concerned with merely obtaining the liquidation of nuclear arms and thereby sweeping the arms race onto another plane, but with making the liquidation of nuclear arms the first big, I would say enormous, step on the path of liquidating war, to affirming a universal system of international security. This can be seen from our proposals. We are fully aware of this tie and this logic. Our proposals are on the table and we are waiting for a reply from the West.

[Zorin] I would like to draw attention to another negative situation of the post-Reykjavik period. This is a great deal of talk, including at the highest levels in Washington, that the policy of strength is precisely the best way to deal with the Soviet Union. In particular, the administration considers the Star Wars program, the SDI, as the concentrated expression of this policy. And Washington asserts that this policy forces the Soviet Union to the negotiating table, to put forward their constructive proposals, and so forth. What do you think, Georgiy Arkadyevich, what can be said in regard to this?

[Arbatov] Well, what could be said in regard to this? It is hogwash, as is much in the dealings of this adminstration. I would put it like this.

The administration is forced to speak differently at different times of the year. Now that the main military budget debates have passed, it can speak about its position of strength. After several months, the military budget debates will resume, and the administration will say that the Russians have superiority. The Americans are simply lying when they assert that we were supposedly almost dragged to the negotiating table, under the SDI threat, so to speak.

Admittedly, they occasionaly speculate on the events of 1983 and 1984, when we, in response to the deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe, left the talks and then returned to the negotiating table. I would not be inclined to argue that either of these steps was done with irreproachable elegance. But they simply had nothing to do with U.S. strength and the SDI. The balance of power did not change during the year in which there were no talks. In fact, it did not change throughout all the years of the Reagan administration. They managed to spend more than a trillion dollars — a trillion and a quarter -- to increase the state debt, but the balance of power did not change.

We are holding talks not because we are scared of the SDI or of U.S. power, but because we realize how dangerous are the tendencies that are working in the world. Our flexibility is not due to fear of U.S. power, but because we wish to find a solution to the problem. This is due to an understanding of the true realities of the contemporary world, from the fact that we truly fear these tendencies that are dragging us to great misfortune. And by the way, these tendencies are just as dangerous to the Americans as they are to us, and they should avoid them as well.

It has already become very difficult to reach agreement, and Comrade Gorbachev has repeatedly said this. But with each month, not to mention each year, it is becoming more and more difficult. The development of military technology and the changes in the world situation are pushing us inexorably, if we continue to drag these talks, to that brink beyond which agreement will perhaps become impossible. That is why we are seeking outcomes. Certainly not because of the SDI, which remains a fantasy, the fruit of a sick imagination, and which, at best, exists only in some form on the drawing board.

[Zorin] Now, I would like to continue our discussion precisely from this point, Georgiy Arkadyevich. SDI could, to some extent, now be in fact called an axis, or one of the main axes...

[Arbatov interrupts] Stumbling block, I would say.

[Zorin] Yes, both an axis of U.S. foreign policy and a stumbling block. Now, insofar as we have Roald Zinnurovich with us at the table, I would like to ask you, the director of the Space Research Institute, Roald Zinnurovich: Is the idea underlying this Star Wars program, what they call the Strategic Defense Initiative, realistic?

[Sagdeyev] Well, I would like to say that, in fact, there are several programs, not one program. Now, if we discuss the very first one, President Reagan's dream, which he expressed in 1983, of creating an ideal, impenetrable shield which would completely eliminate the nuclear threat, then, of course, this is a totally irrational dream and absolutely unrealistic.

[Zorin] Why?

[Sagdeyev] Even if the opposing side did nothing at all, if it froze everything as is, the probability of 100 percent interception is simply ruled out. If we are talking about the opposing side beginning deployment of offensive systems in a spirit of competition between both defensive and offensive systems, it was precisely this danger that led to both sides sitting down amicably in 1972 and signing the antimissile defense limitation treaty.

[Arbatov] At the time, however, it was the Americans who urged us: Understand that offensive arms cannot be reduced or limited if you are vague about defensive arms. They managed to persuade us easily and quickly. We understood this.

[Sagdeyev] As a matter of fact, they now appeal to us -- these are different Americans, these are SDI advocates -- and say: How is it that you have forgotten the wonderful ideas with which your leaders came to the United States -- it was near the end of 1967 -- that defense is humanitarian and moral? This occured in a television dispute with one of the ideologues of Star Wars, General Daniel graham, and I had to say: You are depicting us Marxists as dogmatists. Now, who in fact is a dogmatist in this particular case?

Now, why do we nevertheless consider that SDI represents a great danger? It is because SDI, besides this unrealizable dream, contains a whole collection of the most diverse components, new technical innovations, Besides, there is a mass approach to it.

[Arbatov interrupts] It does not contain this yet, but may contain it (? if work continues).

[Sagdeyev] It may contain this and may serve as a conduit to a great variety of spheres of military technology. If we say: Let us sit down and sign an agreement eliminating nuclear arms, while, in response, we get proposals to transfer the arms race, the technological and political arms race at the same time to some new dimension, then, of course, this is unacceptable, not only to us, but to any person who takes a sober look at how mankind can enter into a new and secure world.

[Arbatov] If I have understood you correctly, Roald Zinnurovich, if we translate this into political language, then one can say that, currently, we are at a kind of crossroads. Currently, a path is being proposed and we have made progress along this path in Reykjavik. We have taken a glance into the future, to where this path leads, and this is a path to disarmament. Now, a nuclear-free world is only a beginning, but we also have in mind conventional and chemical arms, and we understand that these things are interrelated.

Now, instead of this, we are offered a new spiral in the arms race: We shall simply get rid of weapons that are obsolete or will become obsolete soon, so to speak, and enter a new spiral in the arms race connected with SDI, which is completely full of unknown and unpredictable dangers, and which ex extremely unstable and fraught with great shocks and catastrophes. This...

[Sagdeyev interrupts] It sounds something like this. Instead of beating swords into plowshares, let us beat swords into some kind of new type of weapon. [ZORIN] Roald Zinnurovich, you, a prominent scientist and specialist, say that the idea the White House boss cherishes is unrealistic from a scientific and technical point of view. Many of your very prominent colleagues in the United States are saying the same thing.

So, the question arises: Why does this idea exist, and not only exist, but is being implemented? Is not the world of the specialist in this case of sufficient gravity for the political leaders?

[Sagdeyev] I recall that, some time ago, a group of specialists, scientists, and industrial specialists sat down and, on the instructions of a major international organization -- I mean the Papal Academy of Sciences in the Vatican -- was to draw up a memorandum, an assessment of the danger of, and the prospects of, SDI. Many arguments were proposed. As an addendum to the argument about the scientific and technical impracticability of the ideal version, versions of an economic nature were proposed. They noted that SDI, in its pure form, in confrontation with offensive arms lost out economically to the order of 20 to 30 times. And at this moment...

[Arbatov interrupts] In other words, to overcome SDI, 20 to 30 times less needs to be spent.

[Sagdeyev] Yes, in order to overcome SDI with the aid of asymmetrical measures, with the aid of further development and perfection of offensive arms, in order to overcome this potential defense in space, it will be sufficient to spend only a percentage of the funds that will have to be spent for deploying SDI. And at that moment, as one of the conference participants, the vice president of a fairly large U.S. corporation working on defense department contracts, said: As soon as you Russians begin to work on the same thing -- SDI -- all of these economic arguments will immediately lose their value.

[Arbatov] That is another SDI that many Americans also have on their minds. SDI as a tool with which they want to undermine the economy of the Soviet Union, to destroy us economically, so to speak, by imposing on us this new spiral of the arms race.

[Zorin interrupts] It is perfectly clear that it is not all that easy for the U.S. economy to do as somebody wishes. Well ....

[Arbatov interrupts] Concerning the cost of SDI -- Roald Zinnurovich will correct me if I am wrong -- the minimal estimate I have seen is $700 billion. Another estimate is $3 trillion.

[Sagdeyev] All these estimates, minimum and maximum, have been made on the assumption that the potential enemy will simply sleep and wait. If the matter goes to the development of counter-measures, to the asymmetrical approach, then the upper limit will no longer exist. It will go to infinity because SDI will simply become impossible.

[Arbatov] That means that you can ruin anybody.

[Zorin] Roald Zinnurovich, you have spoken about asymmetric measures that are kept in mind. Is it possible to understand that we are not at all inclined and must not build the same kind of umbrella and follow the path that the supporters of the idea of Star Wars in its present form would like us to follow?

[Sagdeyev] I would say that to follow the same path, an asymmetric path, is a path not only connected with huge economic and material expenditures. It is also a path that is dangerous from the point of view of maintaining strategic stability. The new type of strategic balance, in which elements of both offensive and defensive weapons will coexist simultaneously, is very unstable.

One of the options -- a scenario that could develop, a catastrophic scenario -- is that one of the sides can and has in principle the technical capability to knock out its opposite, its double in space -- the defensive system of the opposite side -- with a sudden sneak strike and thus retain a more favorable strategic position for itself.

But there are also other options, an option where SDI would turn out to be completely unnecessary. In this option all strategic nuclear arms would be completely eliminated. Even in the minimal form on which the current administration has been insisting during the last few weeks, even in the option calling for the reduction of only strategic ballistic missiles, SDI becomes senseless...

[Arbatov interrupts] It is all the more unnecessary as it is intended against ballistic missiles only.

[Sagdeyev] Of course, yes. SDI becomes...

[Arbatov interrupts] It is useless against both cruise missiles and aircraft.

[Sagdeyev] And the arguments being used by the current administration in order to defend SDI in this case too, I would say, they are simply curious.

[Zorin] I would like to come to the same question from another angle, and formulate it as follows: Among the arguments used by Star Wars program advocates there is this one: The Soviet Union is coming out so insistently against SDI because it is not in a position to counter this program with something adequate. It cannot compete with the United States on an equal footing, particularly in the scientific and technological fields. What would you say to this, Roald Zinnurovich?

[Sagdeyev] I think that if there will be a need for countermeasures, if the situation with the development of the SDI program takes an irreversible character, our response has already been given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The response will be asymmetrical. And I think...

[Arbatov interrupts] The answer will not be our own SDI, not a mirror image, but countermeasures.

[Sagdeyev] Not our own SDI, but countermeasures. There is a firmly large number of possible countermeasures. There are countermeasures for every SDI option. It is early to go into details today because ...

[Arbatov interrupts] And there is no need to. What for? So that they can take them into consideration? and they are all considerably cheaper, and technologically simpler, as far as I understand.

[Sagdeyev] Absolutely.

[Arbatov] Summing up our discussion on SDI, it can be said that SDI is an illusion, and speaking plainly it is a sham defense, claiming the form of an invulnerable shield against a nuclear strike. Yet SDI is dangerous for two reasons. First, it hinders agreement on a radical reduction of nuclear arms.

That means that it is a torpedo launched against the entire process of arms limitations and talks. Secondly, the SDI is a new spiral, it is the concentration of unprecedented funds on the development of military technology that will signify a new development of various kinds of arms, a new spiral in the arms race. Am I correct?

[Sagdeyev] Yes. I think that I can only add to this that the assent stated by the U.S. Administration in Reykjavik to switch over to a 100 percent reduction of nuclear arms, the elimination of strategic nuclear missiles, makes the SDI simply unnecessary. It is absurd to have such a shield, a shield against whom? Even if you examine some concrete nuances of the SDI and its separate components, it becomes clear that the desire to preserve as some kind of guarantee an SDI option that provides for the use of nuclear-pumped x-ray lasers signifies a direct violation of this potential agreement on the exclusion of strategic nuclear missiles.

What is the x-ray laser componenet of SDI? It is submarines carrying special missiles with very short acceleration times. These missiles, on receipt of signals coming, let us say, from the early warning system, could be launched to an altitutde of about 1,000 km and deploy an x-ray laser unit pumped by a nuclear explosion. That means that a warhead is needed. Thus it turns out that nuclear missiles, nuclear warheads...

[Arbatov] Identical to strategic ones.

[Sagdeyev] Yes... will be the guarantee against any of the sides violating the agreement on the complete elimination of strategic nuclear missiles. Moreover, they are even more dangerous because in the technical aspect they have a short acceleration time. They can be directed to practically any point, and exploded not only in space for pumping the x-ray lasers but also on land, on the territory of a potential enemy.

[Arbatov] Roald Zinnurovich, excuse me. I would like to ask you a question as a specialist. The very idea of this pop up, as it is called in English, these missiles that leap out and the explosions, what is the life of such a laser? It explodes and powers the laser. So what is its duration?

[Sagdeyev] It is a momentary action. It literally lasts a millionth of a second, and it is supposed that during this one millionth of a second the laser must momentarily fire and hit a missile in its launch phase.

[Arbatov] And if the missiles come with some small interval? Apparently this is also a very doubtful weapon.

[Sagdeyev] There are many methods for countering this option. Nevertheless, this SDI option, the beloved brainchild of Edward Teller, is making intensive headway. And we know from publications that several hundred million dollars have been spent on this SDI option alone.

[Zorin] Apparently feeling the weakness of his position in this regard and the potential danger concerning public opinion in this respect, President Reagan, during the electoral campaign that has just closed in the United States, tried to make the 4 November election look like a kind of referendum on U.S. foreign policy, in particular on the SDI issue. Speaking in the White House on 5 November, the day after the elections, the President said that he views the outcome of the elections as support for his military policy and, as he said, especially for SDI.

[Arbatov] Well, I would say of course, that it is a risky statement. First of all, in U.S. history the midterm elections have practically never focused around some foreign policy problem. They are elections for congressmen and one-third of the senators. They focus on local issues and the struggle over the personalities of the candidates. For this reason it was very unusual, it was a kind of violation of tradition for the President to try to make the foreign policy issue the key topic in the elections. The voters were far more concerned with the disastrous position of the farmers, unemployment, and in general with the economic difficulties, connected with a worsening of social problems, than with SDI, considerably more so.

Another point is that most of the problems that really concerned the voters are nonetheless in one way or another connected to foreign policy and especially with huge military spending; this is now being understood in the United States. I think that this is a very important point in these elections. So in this respect there may actually have been some kind of plebiscite. And it ended not at all in favor of the arms race and not in favor of SDI.

I have the impression that the Americans are now listening. They are monitoring the first underground tremors. Not all of them even know that the United States has become a debtor nation, that by 1990 its national debt to foreigners alone, not to mention the domestic debt, will rise to the fantastic sum of $500 billion. They feel and sense the alarm and begin to understand that this feigned optimism of the administration, when it speaks about the economy and other matters, contains a lot of false, hypocritical, and dishonest things. They feel that they are being deceived. And they are being deceived skillfully -- this cannot be denied -- and successfully in some things. Take SDI, for example. Many people in America really hope and believe in it. People want to believe; in the face of such horror as that of nuclear war, they want to believe in something.

[Zorin interrupts] To believe that it is possible to find shelter.

[Arbatov] To believe that it is possible to find shelter. By the way, they are not being told the truth. The government is deceiving them, deceiving them about it being in a position to protect them from a nuclear strike; that SDI will produce some kind of great attainments in the scientific and technical field; or that the only possibility for protecting oneself from a nuclear strike is the elimination of nuclear arms. And in the scientific and technical field, SDI leads not to progress but, on the contrary, to difficulties and stagnation.

[Sagdeyev] Just now in the United States, we asked the question of where is the so-called spinoff, the beginning of applications in the civilian industry? I was given two examples. One example is connected with the use of a very small battery in heart pacemaker units being implanted into the human body. In the process of improving this small battery, in the process of manufacturing smaller and smaller minature versions, it turns out that the Maxwell Laboratories company had to build huge capacitors, capacitor batteries for accelerating a projectile with the aid of a so-called rain gun.

I know this company well, I know how it was founded many years ago. I have many colleagues working there, and I know that these jobs had no relation at all to the SDI program. They were started considerably earlier. I think that only a completely illiterate simpleton can be convinced that gigantic capacitor batteries are needed in order to be able to implant a microscopic low-power battery into a human body.

[Arbatov] Roald Zinnurovich, you must have heard more frequently than I from American specialists the conclusion that research in the military field and especially in the SDI field has gone into such spheres that a return for the civilian economy cannot be expected for at least a few decades. On the contrary, great harm is now being done to both the civilian economy and science because of the massive brain drain. A drain of the best brains, research capabilities, and research potentials from constructive spheres is going into areas connected with SDI, which are fruitless for society.

The results of this militarization of U.S. science are already evident. The United States is very proud of its scientific and technical level, and I would say justly so. The American have made many achievements. But look at what has been happening in the last few years. A separate analysis has been made in the United States of the trade in high technology goods, including computers, instruments, communications equipment, aerospace industry products -- the very apex of science. It turns out that in 1980 Americans sold $27 billion more of these products than they bought. Last year it was only $4 billion more than they bought. And this year they will sell $2 billion less than they will purchase abroad.

That means that they are being beaten by competitors in this field, and they are being beaten primarily because the United States has carried out such a bloodletting of its scientific and technical potential to military fields, including SDI. This did not go unpunished and now it has to be paid for. And by the way, this is the reason Amercians are so inistently pulling their competitors into SDI.

[Arbatov continues] In England, for example, I was told that there are about 100 people there, the most intelligent and promising people, who are receiving salaries simply so that they can run around universities and various companies and purchase at the source. We are talking about the most advanced areas of scientific and technical progress: computers, lasers, new materials, optics -- all of these spheres. In Japan they are totally convinced that the SDI was invented not so much as a threat against the Soviet Union, but as a way to dispose of the Japanese high technology industry once and for all.

[Zorin] If we return to the elections so as to end this topic, I wish to say that I agree that economic -- including not only immediate ones but future ones too, about which you spoke -- have played a decisive role. Nvertheless, it is a fact that a whole series of people personally close to Reagan, who are known as ardent supporters of the Star Wars program, have suffered defeat at these elections, even those candidates who received direct support from the President. Paula Hawkins, for example, in Florida. He spoke there on several occasions, and supported here as an advocate of Star Wars. She lost to a person known as an opponent of Star Wars. So then is situation also ...

[Arbatov interrupts] At the very least this speaks of the of fact that Star Wars did not become a trump card . . .

[Zorin interrupts] A trump card.

[Arbatov] A trump card, and it did not bring in extra votes. This is at the very least. I want to note that Americans, as a rule, have no ideas what the Star Wars program is. Nevertheless the administration succeeded in fooling the average American. Among scientists the situation is different. What do they think at the American Academy of Sciences.

[Sagdeyev] Well, I can say that recently a very curious opinion poll of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences was taken. Several hundred scientists were polled, 540 of these agreed to participate in the poll and answered all the questions. Only 20 people, that is 4 percent of the scientists, said that perhaps SDI is possible.

[Arbatov] Well, you see. It is unfortunate that today there is a difference between the opinions of the educated people and those who take all their knowledge from the mass information media which give the official version.

[Zorin] I wish to touch on another problem in direct relation to our talk today. The U.S. press reports that the United States is about to commission the 131st B-52 bomber armed with cruise missiles. This means an open and direct violation of the SALT-II Treaty, since it exceeds the levels allowed by this treaty. In this way Washington is throwing away one of the most important agreements of the postwar period, an agreement that somehow regulated the process of the arms race and held this process in check. And what is particularly noteworthy and significant is that it is taking place just a few weeks after President Reagan at Reykjavik gave his consent to far-reaching steps directed at ending the nuclear arms race and liquidating nuclear arsenals. How can this be reconciled?

[Arbatov] It cannot be reconciled. It just does not work. But at the same time I think it is a very significant and revealing page of current political life. You see, on the one hand, the fact that it is possible to reduce weapons, all strategic weapons, by 50 percent is not even being argued in the United States. There are only questions of details. How to take into account cruise missiles on submarines and some other details, but in principle there is no argument. Behind this, of course, among other things is the understanding that a huge amount of weapons has been stockpiled, that such quantities are even in some way superfluous, not only for a rational goal -- a rational nuclear goal is impossible -- but even for a rational goal they are not needed.

Nevertheless, they wish to exceed the elementary quantitative level. Why? In my opinion this is very significant. It is not just the bomber armed with 20 cruise missiles that is important. What is important is to break the SALT-II Treaty itself. By the way, this speaks of the uncertainty of the people who are presently in power in the United States. They want to use Reagan's personal prestige and his popularity, his closeness to the military-industrial complex and the fact that he cannot resist the temptation to speed up the arms race, to now break all existing treaties. First the SALT-II treaty, then the antimissile treaty; following which -- if there will be this nuclear pumped [laser] -- the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in space -- a treaty like this also exists.

This also includes, of you like, relations with international organizations and international law. These people do not want any constraints. They now want, they set the following aims: these are cynical people. Their aim is to leave scorched earth after themselves, a desert, in the sense of limiting the arms race, in the sense, even, if you wish, of international law, some form of order, some elementary guarantees of security, so that they have a completely free hand to do whatever they want on a global scale.

[Zorin] And to tie the next administration, no matter what it is, to what will be done now.

[Arbatov] Yes, it is easier to dismantle than to build.

[Zorin] In conclusion, a question on how you imagine the development, under present conditions, considering what we have been saying, of the political process for the forthcoming period.

[Sagdeyev] Reykjavik has shown completely new prospects, new possibilities. Only a year ago it would have been hard to imagine that there would have been anyone in the U.S. Administration who would have agreed to specifically discuss a program of such meaningful reductions, even the total liquidation of strategic nuclear arms. It would have been even more difficult to imagine such specific talks, such specific discussions 4 years ago, when our country was declared the center of evil. And t se new strategic configurations -- in the initial stages this is a 50 percent reduction and in the future, the gradual abandonment of various components of nuclear weapons up to their complete liquidation -- are very new and important food for thought and for analyses at various scientific organizations, in the circles of so-called concerned scientists, and by military strategists.

I think that all these processes will have their place and the pace will pick up, and finally, I think that politicians will have to react to this, including politicians on Capitol Hill, and politicians in the present and perhaps future U.S. Administrations.

[Arbatov] Since you have touched on the United States, I would be inclined to say that we are now standing at the threshold of very interesting developments in the political life of this country, developments connected with that unusual situation -- which has happened before, but is nevertheless unusual -- when both houses of the Congress have an opposition majority. I think that these years will bring about a series of interesting changes and new phenomena in the American economy and in American relations with its allies. So this struggle which will continue around Reykjavik, is now very important. Efforts are now being made to pull back, even though we managed with difficulty to climb to this peak, to Reykjavik. And efforts are being made to pull things back to the starting point. Now the struggle is centered around preventing this; on the contrary, to ensure the possibility of a forward movement to ever loftier heights, and to implement what was discussed in Reykjavik.

Strictly speaking, in Geneva we proposed specific negotiable positions that precisely and strictly set out concrete proposals on which agreement was reached in Reykjavik. I would add even more. It follows that in the proposals that were tabled in Geneva, attempts are made to find some sort of keys to open the last doors that were closed in Reykjavik on the path to agreement.

Besides, I wish to say, that we have by necessity paid a great deal of attention to Soviet-U.S. relations. But if we speak of the future, and even about today, it is very important for us to understand that the world is more than the United States and that our foreign relations are not reduced to Soviet-American relations. We have many other, no less important tasks. Recently, a very important meeting of the leaders of the communist and workers parties of socialist countries came to an end. This was a most important meeting for our foreign policies and very important decisions were made there. Many new actions and initiatives are in the works, both in the Asian direction of our foreign policy and in the European direction, and we will undoubtedly hear about them soon. This long overdue period, of very important and very fruitful diplomatic activity of the Soviet Union, which distinguished the last year and a half, will, I am certain, continue.

[Zorin] Well, our time on the air has elapsed. It remains for me to thank you for participating in our talk today and to thank our television viewers for their attention. And so, until we meet again here in our Studio 9, all the best.

Falin Interview on Reykjavik

AU141041 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 10 Nov 86 p 5

[Interview given by Valentin Falin, chairman of the NOVOSTI press agency, to Jerzy Kraszewski, TRYBUNA LUDU moscow correspondent: "Reykjavik 30 Days on -- The Opportunity Is Still There" -- in Moscow, date not given]

[Text] Valentin Falin, the noted Soviet diplomat, political and press activist, and chairman of the NOVOSTI press agency board, received Jerzy Kraszewski, head of the TRYBUNA LUDU Moscow bureau, and talked with him about some international issues in the light of the results of the M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan meeting. V. Falentin was one of CPSU General Secretary M. Gorbachev's experts during the Reykjavik trip.

[Kraszewski] The futher we move away from Reykjavik, the more heated the world discussions about the results, open difficulties, and problems of the Reykjavik meeting become. At the same time, Washington continues to distort the essence of the Soviet initiatives and to give a false picture of the course of the meeting. A campaign of disinformation and of falsifying the essence of the talks is still continuing in the United States....

That is why I propose that we should turn to the night of 11-12 October. To recapitulate: Following the first day of the talks between M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, two groups of Soviet and U.S. experts began their work, which was reported to have continued from 2000 until 0430 the next day. What did you work on and what really happened during that session?

[Falin] The experts were asked to draw up a concrete accord on the strength of the M. Gorbachev-R. Reagan exchanges of views and the proposals submitted during the first meeting on 11 October. That is why the question asked by Marshal Akhromeyev, who led our group, was simple and specific: What is the American side able to say about Gorbachev's proposals put forward during his meeting with Reagan? Our proposals were submitted in writing -- in Russian and English. The Work of Experts [subhead] [position of subhead as published]

The marshal asked this question, which was followed by a long and wearisome silence. He repeated the question and suggested that the session should concretely examine the Soviet formulations -- sentence by sentence and word by word. Unfortunately, a constructive and positive response, which we expected from the U.S. side, did not materialize. Nitze, Rovny, Kampelman, Edelman, Perle, and others asked for an adjournment.

Although our American colleagues did promise that their consultations would be short, the adjournment was very long. When they returned they handed us a sheet of paper with a message, which we examined and concluded there was nothing new in. The marshal asked whether the U.S. representatives were able to tell what was new in the U.S. counterproposal in relation to the position assumed by the United States at Geneva negotiations on 18 September. The USSR had replied to this earlier.

There was another pause. After a while an embarrased Paul Nitze declared that their counterproposal did not contain anything new and was really a repetition of the 18 September position.

The marshal then recalled that we had been instructed by our leadership not to discuss the proposals that had already been examined in Geneva and on which views had previously been aired.

We were instructed to prepare joint working documents, worked out by the two groups of experts. We had to adopt the 11 October exchange of views between the two leaders as a point of departure for these proposals.

Our American colleagues then gave us to understand that they were not ready to examine the issues in this way. In this situation the Soviet experts proposed that we should adjourn and inform M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan about the new situation. Our proposal was accepted.

We met again at 0300 and we noted that the conduct of the U.S. delegates was a little different. They agreed to open a specific discussion of the text and formulation of the materials under preparation. As a result of this discussion and exchanges of view and, not without difficulties and disputes, including disputes within the U.S. delegation itself, a draft accord was produced on the elimination of strategic weapons in two phases within 10 years.

It was proposed to reduce the strategic carriers of nuclear weapons and nuclear warheads by 50 percent in the first phase and to eliminate all nuclear weapons [bron] in Europe in the first phase, that is, in the first 5-year period. This was that we proposed, but the American insisted that the "zero alternative" should also be applied to the Soviet medium-range missiles [rakiety] in Asia. We said that we could not agree to such a concept, but in the end the two sides agreed to submit the issue of medium-range missiles [rakiety] in Asia to Delegation Chairmen Gorbachev and Reagan.

The issue of verification [kontrola] was a very difficult aspect of our work. We insisted on accepting the principle of triple verification: through national resources, supranational resources, and on-site inspection. The Americans, especially Perle, had doubts about on-site inspection with regard to many specific kinds of weapons, primarily sea-based missiles. We could not agree with them. Motivated by the principles of equality, we argued that on-site inspection must cover all kinds of weapons, including the systems to which the Americans attach special significance for various reasons.

We then discussed the issue of halting nuclear tests. The examination of this issue began from two different poles, if I may say so. The Americans proposed to prepare an accord on the conditions under which explosions would be continued, but rejecting their concept we declared that in line with the two sides' international obligations we insist on drawing up an accord on wholly and completely halting all tests.

In the end, showing great resistance and unwillingness, the Americans conceded such a possibility and our discussion began to revolve around a gradual halting of tests. We agreed that the power of explosions would be gradually lowered and that other restrictions would be introduced. However, all this would be done under the provision that, within a definite, measurable, and specific time, the sides would sign an accord on wholly halting nuclear tests.

Finally, the issue of the absolute observance of the accord on restricting the systems of antimissile defense produced differences that could not be overcome. The Americans adopted an interpretation of the accord that would ultimately reduce the accord to naught. In fact we are asked to participate in the elimination and demolition of this accord. The Americans argued that it was actually obsolete and inconsistent with the present situation.

In this connection they revoked point "D" of the protocol and the right of the United States to terminate the accord. That is why Marshal Akhromeyev pointed to the fact that our partners had falsified the substance of the protocol and that they wanted to apply point "D" to Article 5, although it was Article 3 that was involved. As for Article 5, it simply forbids any work that exceeds the framework of permitted actions, that is, the operation of a restricted number of antimissile defense systems in a single region on earth and only on earth. Article 5 forbids installing, creating, and testing the systems and components of weapons using mobile sea, air, and space bases.

The U.S. representatives did not question this reservation, but they argued that their views were different. We agreed to report to our leaderships on the situation that developed. And this was in principle the conclusion of everything.

I repeat: We achieved considerable progress. In fact we were able to formulate conditions for eliminating nuclear weapons in two stages. In the first 5 years we would reduce all systems of offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent and wholly eliminate them by the end of the 10-year period. Other issues remain partly open -- the issue of medium-range missiles in Asia and the issue of the accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems. The United States refuses to fulfill its obligations stemming from this accord.

Two Sides of the Same Coin [subhead]

[Kraszewski] I take the following view of what you have just said: The U.S. side was taken aback by the scale and unusual nature of the Soviet proposals. The U.S. side was not ready for serious discussions. How can this be explained? Why did President Reagan come to Reykjavik empty-handed? What did he count on? What principles is he now following when he ascribes to himself his own initiatives and those that are not his?

[Falin] All this is most complicated, you know. Of course, the U.S. President came to Reykjavik empty-handed insofar as constructive, wide-ranging initiatives and a qualitative breakthrough in disarmament negotiations are concerned. It could be that, believing in various rumors and reports supplied by various U.S. agencies, he thought that we would be satisfied with some partial and intermediate settlements, with some cosmetic actions, or with some temporary accord in order to keep alive the feeble embers of dialogue....

Of course, the President was not psychologically prepared to decide on a radical change in the situation and in the very method of negotiations. He was not prepared to turn away from the nuclear world to a non-nuclear one within the specified deadline of 10 years, to erect barriers to the arms race in new areas, and to halt the present dangerous development of the situation.

On the other hand, as a man and president and, especially as the leader of the U.S. governing faction, prior to elections he did not want to appear in an unfavorable light and be regarded as a politician whose appraisal of prospects was not quite correct or was quite incorrect. Judging by many post-Reykjavik events, it is apparent that his tactic involved the following concept: To achieve an accord on the strength of the Soviet proposals on eliminating nuclear weapons and then "put aside" everything, confront this accord with the SDI program, and put forward the "Strategic Defense Initiative" as an initial condition for Soviet agreement to demolish the accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems and as a premise for achieving some measure of progress in some other areas, if theoretically at all possible.

From the viewpoint of disarmament issues and the methods of negotiations all this is completely illogical. Every reasonable human being realizes that it is impossible to count on progress in disarmament by demolishing what was previously achieved in this regard and what is one of the sine qua non conditions for continuing the process of disarmament.

Attempts were made to turn unfaithfulness to one accord into an invitation to conclude another.... They want to sacrifice the interminable accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems to definite ambitious plans, saying in this connection that the United States is a good partner for some future settlements....

And what if our conduct were like that? The United States would and should have rejected it, if it stuck to a logical line on preserving and strengthening the norms of international law. It is a fact that only on the basis of these norms is it possible to create normal and stable relations among states.

It goes without saying that the Soviet side had to reject the U.S. concepts. It could not help rejecting them. Otherwise we would have betrayed principles. I wish to stress clearly that from the very beginning -- from the moment when the 1972 accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems was negotiated and signed -- the sides were aware that there was a mutual link between restricting the arms race on earth and preventing such a race in other spheres. There is a mutual connection between restricting strategic offensive weapons and restriting strategic defense weapons. These are the two sides of the same coin. Severing this connection would amount to incapacitating both restrictions. In such a case there would follow an unrestricted offensive arms race and, correspondingly, an unrestricted arms race in those areas that we formally call defensive.

Why is the U.S. President now ascribing to himself other people's initiatives and ideas? Let us be more specific and say "some of the other people's initiatives and ideas," because he is far from wholly ascribing them to himself. What he is doing is merely fishing out from other people's proposals and initiatives only that which he is able to present to the American people in an attractive way. It is most probable that this is a result of the domestic peculiarities of the U.S. situation and of the recent elections. You have to put a good face on a bad game....

The Historic Dimension of the Soviet Proposals [subhead]

[Kraszewski] How do you appraise the world's response to the results of the Reykjavik meeting?

[Falin] I think that the general response, the response of the majority, shows that people are aware that a constructive and positive breakthrough could have been achieved in Reykjavik, that there were conditions for such a breakthrough, that the Soviet proposals are of truly historic dimensions, and that they created opportunities that could ensure a further development of civilization on stable foundations and guarantee clear and transparent prospects.

People are also convinced that Reagan has sacrificed this opportunity on the altar of the U.S. militaristic plans. And if the minority, that is, the governments of countries that are closest to the United States or rather the NATO political groups that are closest to the White House (Thatcher, the Kohl government) approve of the Reagan stand, then theirs is not a genuine homage but a homage to the narrow and coldly calculated interests that link the imperialist countries within the aggressive NATO bloc. Of course, as world public opinion polls and other facts indicate, these positions of the governing circles are in conflict with the views of most peoples, even of those in the NATO countries.

[Kraszewski] However, some Western circles pose this question at times: Could not the USSR take yet another step and agree to the American alternative? I mean SDI. Why is it so dangerous? What are the dangers involved in this program? Another question indirectly connected with this issue: How would you appraise the post-Reykjavik course of the present round of Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva?

[Falin] All compromises have their limits. Wherever principles are violated a possiblity for compromise no longer exists. The United States did not seek a compromise. What it wanted was for the other side to capitulate before the unreasonable and extremely dangerous U.S. demands. I have in mind the demand to demolish the accord on restricting the antimissle defense systems and to start an arms race in space.

But the facts are: If we want to end the arms race on earth we cannot permit the arms race to be transferred to this space. If we do not want to prevent an arms race in space, this means that we want to step up the arms race on earth. This is the only way in which the issue can be viewed. That is why Gorbachev told Reagan the following: The Soviet Union cannot countenance doing away with the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems, and will not take part in the process. If the Americans want to assume responsibility for destroying a treaty that is the cornerstone of the entire disarmament process that is their affair. The Soviet Union will not be their partner in this.

Why does the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative pose a danger? Because SDI is not a defensive system, it is not even a antimissile defense system. SDI is an attempt to make the arms race enter a qualitatively new phase. It is an attempt to create a weapons system based on new principles in physics, a weapons system whose scale and consequences are comparable to those of nuclear weapons. One can say that it is an attempt to find a way out of the blind alley in which the world finds itself at the present time with the help of even more dangerous weapons, weapons that are even more treacherous. The Union States believes that this weapons will provide it with military superiority, at least at some point in its development. They wish to exploit this possible superiority in a struggle with the socialist countries.

The world, all of us, face a choice at the present time: Should we permit such a course of events to take place or not? Should we allow mankind to be exposed to a new danger and become even more dependent on military technology than at present?

The system we are talking about is meant to operate so quickly that a human being will not have an opportunity to make a conscious decision when a danger arises. Control of the arms race, even in theory, will not be possible. It will not be a question of there being hours or minutes to make a decision, but seconds. There are no geniuses or wise men who would find those few seconds sufficient time to reach a decision.

And that is where the root of the entire danger lies. SDI is a label, the packaging for other objectives. Besides, this has been the case in the past. Can one mention at least one postwar American strategy that was not called "defensive" in U.S. terminology? The planned elimination of socialism and communism throughout the world was also called "defensive." In this sense, nothing has changed. The directives for the development of the American Armed Forces formulated by the Pentagon in May 1982 set everything out plainly, in black and white. The aim of the arms race in space is to divest all the defense investments of socialist countries of their value -- investments made over decades -- and to compel the USSR and other socialist countries to embark on an arms race in spheres that we find uncomfortable.

As M. Gorbachev said: We are in a position to respond to these "uncomfortable spheres" by applying far more economical and effective solutions. If SDI takes the form of a weapons system that orbits the earth, we will be able to put it out of action by using only a small part of the resources that the Americans will have to expend in order to build themselves a system of this kind.

However, the technologies developed to meet the needs of the program will remain. It will not be possible to render these technologies harmless. Once they have been created, technologies live, exist. The spreading of these technologies throughout the world will make the fate of civilization rest on whether an unfortunate accident takes place or not. When one considers prospects for the future, this is precisely what needs to be clearly borne in mind.

The Geneva Negotiations [subhead]

And now for your question about the course of the Geneva negotiations.

Our position, which was formulated by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, is as follows: The Soviet proposals are on the table. We believe that the only correct way forward is one that starts from the point reached at Reykjavik. Reykjavik brought us to a point at which it was already possible to issue ministers with concrete directives and to establish real principle for agreements for the elimination of nuclear weapons over the course of the next 10 years.

The Soviet side would, of course, like to assume that the Americans will go forward, and that they will not start to back out. Unfortunately, there is no certainty that they will behave this way. More than that, the facts attest to the outcome being quite the opposite.

[Kraszewski] The following doubts emerged during the course of discussion on the results produced by the Reykjavik meeting: Is it not the case that the USSR is going too far in the compromises that it is prepared to make? Will concessions not weaken the security of the USSR and its allies? What is your view of these doubts?

The compromises discussed at Reykjavik do, of course, carry a certain risk. If there was a danger that the American side would not accept the obligations that it might undertake then the USSR and its allies would be faced with certain complications. This might prove to be the case if only because, as you know, the nuclear forces of France and England would not be covered by the first stage of a possible settlement.

But it is certainly true that the compromise discussed at Reykjavik does have a foundation, a basis that is fully justified, and that it also suits the new stage in political development and the development of military technology. However, it does rest on one condition: that a U.S. decision on radical reductions in nuclear arms followed by the complete abandonment of such weapons will be serious and lasting, and on condition that the situation that arose 10 years ago does not repeat itself. The United States promised that it wanted detente and peaceful coexistence but later proceeded, in effect, to back out of these promises. If one accepts that in theory such a reversal in American policy is possible, than I am prepared to agree with the fears that you have expressed. Compromises do conceal a risk.

But if at the very outset we assume that the other side will not observe treaties and other possible agreements, then it is best not to start negotiations at all. We want to believe that the United States can and ought to be a reliable partner because in the final analysis this also lies in its interests.

"Can one believe President Reagan at all? He said one thing in Reykjavik and then something entirely different when he returned to Washington." This question was posed in" letter sent to the editors of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA by a reader in Irkutsk. He is not the only one to have such misgivings.

What Next? [subhead]

[Kraszewski] I realize that it is difficult to make predictions at the present time but I would like to end our conversation by asking a question: "What next? Is there a chance that an agreement that would pave the way to complete nuclear disarmament can be concluded with the present administration? Are you, personally, an optimist or a pessimist?

[Falin] It is understandable that trust in the American Administration has not grown in Moscow after what we have been witnessing in the United States, these downright attempts to "rectify" Reykjavik, to call white black, black white. I think it is doubtful whether people in the United States believe Reagan more today than yesterday. Probably not. The President and his ministers cannot strengthen people's trust in them if what they say today is different from what they said yesterday; if tomorrow they deny what they say today; if commentaries from Speakes and others are necessary to clarify the essence of the ambiguous words that Reagan uses; and if no one at all knows what is going to happen next.

However, there is one big "but." It is not we who determine the election of American presidents, senators, and members of the House of Representatives. Elections are held in accordance with the principles that obtain in the United States, principles that it is customary to call democratic. These principles produce an unstable mechanism of government marked by policy inconsistencies and unpredictable actions, which are a burden for the entire world community. However, we have no other partners.

Should we wait until someone wiser appears or until this President comes to his senses? We can. But time flies and time is not neutral. New weapons systems appear, stockpiles of old weapons grow, and new dangers and problems which are increasingly difficult to resolve accumulate. Thus, there is only one way out: We must try again and again to convince the leadership, the society, and the United States Congress that rejecting the offer of cooperation from the socialist states does not lie in their interests.

We must try to convince them that it is no longer possible to create a security system exclusively for the United States, one that is based on threatening others. Today, security can only be a common and universal matter. We must convince them that it is not possible to solve security problems by employing military means, that the main problem is a political one.

Whether we succeed in this depends on the responsiveness of governing people in the United States to new, fresh ideas. It will depend on the ability of these people to use power for positive ends and to overcome what has been America's weakness for many decades — as one American journalist wrote -- all the United States' problems stem not from imperfect muscle but from imperfect reason.

One should be neither an optimist nor a pessimist, but a sober realist. One should not allow the opportunity that exists to pass us by, and one should not see things in excessively dark colors, even when the actions of the United States give no grounds for being particularly optimistic...

PACT MILITARY COUNCIL MEETING RESULTS REPORTED

PM141615 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

["On the Results of a Routine Session of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces Military Council" — IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A routine session of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces Military Council was held 12 through 14 November 1986 in the Romanian capital of Burcharest under the chairmanship of Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces.

Military Council members and senior officials from the defense ministries of the Warsaw Pact states and Joint Armed forces' administrative organs took part in its work.

The Military Council discussed the question of the results and conclusions stemming from the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Reykjavik. The allied socialist states' important contribution to safeguarding peace was noted and the need to step up joint efforts in the interests of struggling to eliminate nuclear arms and reduce conventional arms and to strengthen international security was stressed.

Specific measures were outlined for maintaining troops and naval forces on detachment from the allied armies to the Joint Armed Forces at a level ensuring that military parity between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc is maintained.

The session also summed up the results of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces' operational and combat training over the last year, defined tasks for the new training year, and examined other questions of the Joint Armed Forces' current activity.

In the opinion of all the session participants the need to further expand and deepen combat collaboration among the allied armies was reaffirmed.

The Military Council adopted agreed recommendations and proposals on the questions that were discussed.

The session was held in a businesslike atmosphere and in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding.

VIETNAM'S TRUONG CHINH DEPARTS FROM MOSCOW

LD141931 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS — Truong Ching, general secretary of the Central Committee of Vietnam's Communist Party and chairman of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, has left Moscow today.

He attended the working meeting of the heads of the fraternal parties of the socialist member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

The head of the fraternal party was seen off by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Commitee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

COMMENTARY DENIES 'CONJECTURE' ON CEMA SUMMIT

LD151412 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0350 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary]

[Text] The foreign mass media are commenting on the Moscow meeting of the leaders of the fraternal parties of the CEMA member countries. The communist and workers press stresses the great importance of the results of the meeting for accelerating the CEMA countries' progress and raising the level of their cooperation. Western radio voices, however, such as the West German station Deutsche Welle, are attempting to portray the meeting as arising out of almost some sort of emergency and are trying to find disagreement in how the participants in the meeting approached the issues under discussion. At the microphone is our commentator, Vladimir Pasko.

[Pasko] First of all I would note that the agreement to hold such meetings was reached at the CEMA economic conference back in 1984. Any talk that this latest meeting arose because of some sort of special circumstances is nothing more than conjecture. Two years ago the CEMA leaders, deeming it useful to step up the collective efforts to develop cooperation and socialist economic integration, considered it expedient, I quote, to hold top-level party and state leadership meetings to coordinate the mainline directions in the strategy of economic development and promotion of the international socialist division of labor. The cardinal problems of the development and further improvement of cooperation and possiblities for opening up more fully the creative potential of socialism were the subject of discussion at the latest working meeting in Moscow, too. The leaders of the fraternal parties paid particular attention, as you know from the statement, to the further deepening of relations in the economic sphere and the utilization of new and the most progressive forms of economic, scientific and technological cooperation. What is the thrust of this? It is a matter of restructuring the cooperation between the CEMA countries and the mechanisms of cooperation in accordance with the requirements to switch their economies on to the tracks of intensification. You will recall that in the period since the previous meeting of the CEMA leaders there have been remarkable events on that path. A comprehensive program for the scientific and technological progress of the CEMA countries was drawn up and adopted, and a start has been made on implementing it; the 5-year plans have been coordinated, taking into account the recommendations of the economic conference; and a number of major-scale, multilateral agreements along the priority lines of cooperation are being implemented.

At the same time, as practice has shown, the CEMA countries also encounter difficulties in implementing the decisions adopted. These questions were discussed at the recent CEMA meeting. The countries of the community are unanimous in the view that new forms are needed to make their economic development and cooperation dynamic. One of these chief forms today are direct links between producers and the setting up of financially autonomous joint associations, enterprises, design offices and other international collectives. But for this, as was noted at the session, the necessary conditions have to be created. In this instance these conditions are the improvement of price-setting, currency and financial relations, and legal contractual structures -- quite substantial issues, as you realize.

At their working meeting the leaders of the fraternal parties also exchanged opinions on topical international questions. That, too, is natural. The external conditions of the development of the CEMA countries remain complex: imperialism is using means of economic war against us. But the most important thing is that international tension remains.

In its attempt to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union, the United States is transferring the arms race into space. It would be surprising if, in these conditions, questions of world politics were left out of the purview of the participants in the meeting, and of course this did not happen. What were the results of the discussion? The leaders of the fraternal parties supported the principled stance of the Soviet Union at the Reykjavik meeting. They stressed the need to intensify their joint efforts in the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons, reduce conventional weapons, and strengthen peace and international security.

To try and find disagreements within the socialist community and, what is more, to build a policy upon this -- which is what our ideological opponents are engaged in -- is a hopeless waste of time. The West has had numerous occasions to learn this. Despite all the diversity of the conditions in which the socialist countries find themselves they are working on the solution of a common task. The joint discussion of cardinal problems enables us to advance more rapidly and overcome the difficulties more resolutely. As our party's Central Committee Politburo noted, the Moscow meeting confirmed yet again the desirability of asserting this form of cooperation among the communist and workers' parties.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA ASSESSES RESULTS OF CEMA

LD131059 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2349 GMT 12 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS) -- Objective possibilities based on the very nature of socialism, guarantee its indisputable advantage in all directions of competition between the two social systems, Leonard Kraynov, the author of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA international review writes, commenting on the results of the meeting of leaders of fraternal parties of socialist CEMA member states in Moscow. But we are not only optimists, we are also realists and know very well that any possiblities and resources do not happen automatically. No matter how noticeable the economic achievements of our community are, new tasks appear every day. It is, of course, easier to solve them and to overcome difficulties jointly. by pulling resources together, exchanging experiences, implementing this experience jointly, and taking into account specific conditions of each individual country, we multiply our achievements and the strength of all world communism.

CEMA countries do not see themselves as a closed group, the review says. They are in favor of normalizing international relations in the area of economy, science, and technology, for the removal of any kind of articial obstacles, for trust among states. They speak resolutely against the arms race, militarization of space, and the preparation of thermonuclear war. In the course of the meeting, leaders of fraternal parties exchanged views on topical issues of the contemporary international situation. Having supported the principled position of the Soviet Union in Reykjavik, participants in the meeting underlined the necessity to increase joint efforts in the interests of the struggle for liquidating nuclear and reducing conventional weapons, for strengthening peace and international security.

We are convinced that such fate can be prevented. Again and again the socialist community proposes to come to an agreement on the most important problem of our days -- the existence or otherwise of human civilization. The socialist countries are in favor of dialogue, the author points out. But they do not want discussion at the negotiations table to be turned into a smokescreen concealing the arms race. Today, particularly after the Reykjavik meeting and after the United States' refusal to accept the USSR's clear and effective peace proposals, even the most politically inexperienced person will say that the strategy of the socialist countries is a strategy of peace, creation, and humanitarianism.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD161926 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 16 Nov 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor of TRUD; Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, member of editorial board of NOVOYE VREMYA; Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, political observer of Central Television and All-Union Radio]

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, comrades. A major international event of the past week has been the working meeting in Moscow of leaders of the fraternal parties of the socialist member countries of CEMA. As you know, the Politburo of the Central Committee of our party noted that the positions of the CPSU set forth at the meeting are a practical expression of the priority we intend to give to the development of relations with the socialist countries and the strengthening of world socialism. It should be said that first reactions to the Moscow meeting already bear striking witness to the great interest this important event has aroused throughout the world. And I must say that interest is shown both by those who are our friends, and by those who are not. As for the latter, their voices were heard on various radio stations predicting that the Moscow meeting would run into all sorts of difficulties.

Well, once again, these prophets of doom have disgraced themselves, since the meeting passed in an atmosphere of cordiality, frankness, mutual understanding and unity on all the matters discussed. And these were, indeed, matters of the very greatest importance, concerning the cardinal problems of the development and improvement of cooperation among the socialist countries and the fuller realization of the creative potential of socialism.

Special attention was paid at the Moscow meeting to the further deepening of their relations in the economic sphere, and to the use of the most progressive new forms of economic and scientific-technical collaboration. I know, Rudolf Georgiyevich, that your paper, TRUD, writes a great deal about the various forms of that cooperation. What can you tell us about it?

[Kolchanov] From this point of view it's important to emphasize that the cooperation itself is very dynamic: it alters commensurately with the changes that occur in the state of the economy of our countries. We talk nowadays about the need to expand direct links among the enterprises of our fraternal states. You know, in principle this isn't a new problem. I remember when I was a newspaper correspondent in Czechoslovakia, in a small town in Czechoslovakia, I came across an instance -- I'm making a point of mentioning the smallness of the town, because you might say it's only a particular case. In cooperation with the Vladimir Scientific Research Institute, they had jointly developed asynchronous motors. These are not a product of the most worldwide importance, but this direct contact was such a success that they rapidly attained international parameters, were successfully launched on the international market, and, altogether, showed in this individual but concrete case how substantial and practical such ties can be. We're now entering a new stage in the development of these direct contacts, with the setting up of joint production associations or joint industrial enterprises. But you remember, colleagues, that not so long ago Comrade Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, signed an agreement in Poland on the establishment of the first five Soviet-Polish joint enterprises. Well, and now, after the 42d meeting of the CEMA session, the appropriate documents have been signed between the USSR and Hungary, the USSR and Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the GDR.

[Zholkver] Yes, I'd like to quote a few specific examples of the way this kind of direct cooperation is already taking shape and being developed. There are, for instance, the machine-tools with the trademark "I.S." which have now appeared and are beginning to enter the international market. They are made at the "Ivanovo-Sofia" production association. They are a new machine-tool with program control, and really show how, by joining scientific research potential to production potential, we can achieve not only an addition of resources, but a multiplication.

[Kolchanov] Incidentally, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, the newspapers TRUD and the Bulgarian TRUD are holding an international seminar on this very subject in Ivanovo at the end of this month. We're expecting guests from Bulgarian enterprises, and there'll be Soviet experts and also journalists. The experts will be exchanging opinions, and the journalists will write about it in our papers, Bulgarian TRUD and Soviet TRUD.

[Zholkver] Of course I'd say that to some extent this is still only the beginning. There are a lot of problems and difficulties, and I...

[Kolchanov, interrupting] ...which we'll be talking about at the seminar, of course.

[Zholkver] I saw an interview given by CSSR premier Comrade Strougal, after the CEMA session in Bucharest which you mentioned, Rudolf Georgiyevich; and he remarked that at the session, too, there was no question of passing over in silence questions connected with delays in implementing the integrated program for the scientific-technical progress of the CEMA countries; the production phase remains, as yet, a weak spot in the implementation of the objectives mapped out by the program -- so there's still a lot of work to be done. But it's gratifying, of course, that we can already point to positive results of this sort. Take, for example, the fact that as a result of the expansion and deepening of collaboration between the Soviet and Hungarian motor industries, we'll be receiving next year from Hungary 4,000 of the new Ikarus articulated urban buses. I think the inhabitants of many of our towns will be pleased about that.

[Lebedev] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, the CEMA session in Bucharest also approved a program of great importance, fundamental importance, especially in view of certain events that we all know about, namely the program for the building of atomic electric power stations and heat supply stations. The program covers the period up to the year 2000; and it envisages that by the beginning of the new century, the total capacity of atomic electric power stations in the CEMA countries, not counting the USSR, will be increased to 50 million kilowatts -- as against the present 8 million. That means that 30 to 40 percent of the total electricity produced will be generated at atomic stations. And I think this decision, and its unanimity, and incidentally the positive response it's getting in the socialist countries, is very important -- let us not pretend otherwise -- in the light of, taking into account, the accident at Chernobyl. And, by the way, our magazine writes in its latest issue that the fourth set of the atomic electric power station in Southern Moravia, in Czechoslovakia, has just been started. And the correspondent we asked to prepare a reportage about the opening of the station was pretty meticulous in the questions he put to both the chief engineer and other experts as regards safety measures. It's very characteristic that they'd envisaged and rehearsed even the most improbable situations -- even the event, for instance, that, God forbid, an aircraft might crash on to the station, or, again, the possibility of various systems being put out of action. And generally, the Czechoslovakian experts spoke with great confidence of the safety cordon. Altogether, it's clear that this is the only promising sphere in solving the power problem at the present stage, and as you see, the CEMA countries are implementing it vigorously and harmoniously.

[Zholkver] I'd like to add that cooperation is being expanded in the implementation of another very important program, too -- our country's food program. Here, cooperation is underway in various areas of activity. Let me give a few examples of what I'd call the most direct involvement in this program. For instance, a joint Polish-Soviet enterprise is being built in one small Polish town. It's a food factory that will manufacture a varied range of semifinished products from potatoes. Poland has modern technology for potato production, and this large enterprise will supply potato semi-products to both Poland and the Soviet Union. As another example, you mentioned, Rudolf Georgiyevich, our cooperation with Czechoslovakia. There's a little town in Slovakia, Nove Zamky -- you've probably been there -- where they have a small engineering works, "Sigma", specializing in pumps for irrigation systems, including irrigation systems in the Soviet Union. That's also a contribution to the food program.

[Lebedev] While on the subject of the restructuring of economic and scientific-technical links between Soviet enterprises and enterprises in the other socialist countries, I think one should underline particularly the very businesslike and, I'd say, real nature of that restructuring. We talk about joint enterprises. So far, there aren't many. One of the oldest, I think, is probably the mining and enrichment combine at Erdenet in Mongolia, which has been in operation for quite a while. But there are not many of them yet, and so the question is, when will we have them? What will they be like? And this brings me to what I want to say about Soviet-Polish joint enterprises, for example. Preparations for commissioning them are already in hand, on a very businesslike basis. The managers of several Polish and Soviet factories have been getting together. The necessary technical documentation is being drawn up, and the engineers are interpreting the mechanisms of a new joint production process. How soon these joint enterprises will start operating, will now depend directly on the specific labor collectives, on the state bodies whose job it is to stimulate their work. But here it's necessary to stress that whereas formerly the countries collaborated more at the highest level, at the level of ministries, now cooperation is being organized between labor collectives and enterprises. This a guarantee of economic successes, and it's also a guarantee of the political strength of our community.

[Zholkver] Moreover, not only bilateral -- this is the basis at present it is true -- but also multilateral cooperation. There are very much such examples where you see how the one thing is successfully combined with another. You have mentioned the example of Poland. Indeed, for instance in Gdansk recently an unusual anniversary was marked at the "Lenin" shipyard, the 900th vessel left the slips of this Gdansk shipyard, and this vessel, a large dry-cargo vessel, was built to an order from the Soviet Union once again. But it is interesting that after this at another shipyard, not so well known, but there in Gdansk there is the relatively small Wisla yard. Until recently this yard built small vessels for fishing. At present a quite new research catamaran vessel from the Iskatel series, as it is called, for work on the "Shelf" program, that is to say for oil recovery from the depths of the sea-bed, has been created on a joint Soviet-Polish project. And here's the interesting part. It would appear to be a Soviet-Polish project, but elaboration of the "Shelf" program is not only going on in our countries but also in Vietnam, for example. This means that here bilateral cooperation turns into multilateral cooperation, and what is particularly important, countries with a higher level of economic development are rendering assistance to countries that are only coming up.

[Kolchanov] Yes, this was noted at the 42d sitting of the CEMA session. This was particularly stressed in relation to Cuba, as well as Vietnam and Mongolia.

[Zholkver] This was clearly demonstrated just now at the Congress of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party. In the report by Comrade Phomvihan it was noted, in particular, that over the past decade the social product in this country, which was under foreign domination for 200 years and at times was not even represented on the map of the world, in this country the gross national product has doubled over a decade. The income per head of the population has increased by 60 percent. I would note especially that work to eliminate illiteracy in Laos has largely been completed. And Comrade Phomvihan noted openly that this is the contribution not only of the Laotian people itself, but also of the fraternal assistance from all socialist countries. I think that in this connection generally one should note that socialist states are not only coordinating their economic, but also their foreign policies successfully. Thus at the Moscow meeting all the leaders of the fraternal parties unanimously support the principled position of the Soviet Union in Reykjavik. At the moment this is more than topical -- 1 month exactly has passed since the Soviet-U.S. meeting in the Icelandic capital. It seems to me personally that when you talk about the month that has passed since Reykjavik one cannot but note that the world over that time has in many respects already become a different place.

I remember that FRG Foreign Minister Genscher has stated in the past few days that it would be impossible to return to pre-Reykjavik times, although such attempts are being made here and there, as is well known, primarily in Washington. But as for our country, at both the Moscow meeting and in speeches by Comrade Gorbachev directly after Reykjavik our striving to go further was stressed. Well, an agreement did not come from Reykjavik. This development has to be continued and it is exactly this aim that the Soviet proposals were pursuing that were submitted after Reykjavik, on 7 November if I am not mistaken, by the Soviet delegation in Geneva.

[Lebedev] Yes, that is quite right, Aleksandr Vladimirovich. Altogether you have, in my opinion, given a fair account of this tendency, or rather the struggle between two tendencies. The one -- this is not making it appear that nothing at all happened, but at least trying to give a quite different tenor to those accords, or the rapprochement in positions that took place there, and, well, the other tendency is to really move forward, which we are calling for, based, of course, on the closeness in positions which they succeeded in achieving there. And in this connection over the past days I would not, for example, be so bold as to predict which of the two tendencies is winning through. For we know that virtually the same groups of experts, made up of almost the same people that sat over the nights in Reykjavik sat in Vienna.

[Zholkver] You mean the Soviet-U.S. talks?

[Lebedev] The Soviet-U.S. talks that went on in Vienna, taking advantage of the stay there of both the Soviet foreign minister and Secretary of State Shultz. And once again, unfortunately, the result looks fairly discouraging because the U.S. side is once again trying to prove, and moreover prove by very unfitting means, that an agreement was made on something quite different.

[Zholkver] What do you mean?

[Lebedev] Well, for instance, they are making it appear that when the U.S. President talked about America's readiness to achieve a scrapping of nuclear weapons, or at least a cardinal reduction, by 50 percent, of strategic armaments, then it turns out that President Reagan, despite what was recorded at Reykjavik, had in mind not a reduction generally in all strategic offensive armaments, but merely in ballistic missiles.

I'm sorry, but this is an attempt, well, as I said, using unfitting means, because everyone knows that the United States would acquire an overwhelming superiority in heavy bombers with long-range cruise missiles for instance, and so on. In Geneva the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments have continued. It is only just now, if I'm not mistaken, that their sixth round has ended. And today I was a little -- well I won't stay in confusion -- but astounded when I read a statement by the head of the U.S. delegation, Kampelman, after the end of this round. Mr. Kampelman is making it appear that everything is, you know, as in the song: Madame la Marquise, tout va tres bien, tres bien. At the same time when you read the statement of the head of the Soviet delegation, Comrade Karpov, then a rather different picture reveals itself, namely that unfortunately the U.S. delegation remains in its position and a constructive response, which presupposes that the United States will embark upon a radical reduction in nuclear armaments, of the whole of the triad, that is to say that both sides are accepting the reduction of all their strategic offensive nuclear weapons without exception -- there is no such understanding. What are they expecting from us, strictly speaking? Maybe that, as appears fleetingly sometimes in the press even in the statements of some Western officials, certain domestic difficulties, as they allege will force the Soviet Union to make some concessions.

In this regard I believe that the reaction to this of Paul Nitze, was very correct. He is a veteran of all these talks, who was in Reykjavik too, by the way, an aide to the U.S. President. He said that, first of all, the Russians would not make any concessions that would subject their security to a threat and, second, that he did not believe in any possibility of concessions of the basis of certain domestic difficulties.

[Kolchanov] I should like to add to what was said by Aleksandr Aleksandrovich what was expressed a few days ago by Comrade Ligachev at a press conference in Helsinki. This also concerned specific, quite specific proposals that are directed at curbing the arms race, and which in the final analysis lead to disarmament, although they concern North Europe as such. Comrade Ligachev named four points very specifically and precisely. The first point: what has the Soviet Union already done to move along this road, to demonstrate its real striving for peace? We have already dismantled launching installations for medium-range missiles on the Kola Peninsula, most of the launch installations for such missiles on the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic region military districts. We have transferred from these districts seven divisions of operational tactical missiles. These are concrete steps.

Second, in confirming our support for the idea of giving non-nuclear status to the waters of the Baltic Sea within the framework of the implementation of the proposals for a nuclear-free North, we could, Comrade Ligachev said, in the event of the achieving of an accord on this matter between the appropriate states, withdraw from the complement of the Soviet Baltic Fleet submarines equipped with ballistic missiles -- a major step, a constructive step.

Third, in supporting the idea of possible confidence-building measures applying to North Europe and the waters of the seas adjacent to this region the Soviet Union is proposing that a limitation on the intensity of large military maneuvers in this region be started, and fourth, which was talked about at the press conference in Helsinki, we share the thought that in the way of strengthening confidence-building measures in the naval sphere the positive experience should be used of the Soviet-U.S. agreement of 1972 on averting incidents in the open sea and in the air space above it.

Besides the essential content, so to speak, of this fourth point I should like to stress one point. Across the ocean fairly often they kick up a racket about alleged nonobservance by the Soviet Union of accords that were signed previously and this case shows the extent that the Soviet Union apporoaches all agreements that have been signed previously honestly, and the extent that it follows the letter and spirit of these agreements.

[Zholkver] Well, it's perfectly obvious why they have, let's say, taken up arms so much in that same Washington against the antimissile defense treaty, because it hinders the deployment of space weapons. Now, in fact, everyone accepts that the main -- and, perhaps, the only -- reason why no agreement could be reached at Reykjavik is SDI, the U.S. so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, which the Americans themselves far more accurately call the Star Wars program.

Here are some curious comments from the United States last week. The first comment is by the eminent U.S. scientist Jerome Wiesner. He is the honorary president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and former scientific adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He has now declared plainly that Reykjavik showed that the two aims -- the so-called space defense and the freeing of the whole world from the nuclear threat -- contradict one another. All the "i"s have been dotted. It is a case of "either, or."

Incidentally, this same Jerome Wiesner acknowledges that, from the purely technical -- and, if you will, technological -- point of view, the SDI program is impracticable. It is dangerous, but it is impracticable. And, incidentally, even such a specialist in fantastic projects that do not always seem to be technically feasible as Arthur Clarke, one of the greatest U.S. writers of sciece fiction, also states that, in fact, these U.S. projects in space -- he calls them Stars of Death, the title, perhaps, of Arthur Clarke's next novel -- he said they are not practicable from the point of view of the creation of a defensive umbrella, but they may, unfortunately, become a highly effective offensive weapon for the purpose of, as he puts it, overseeing the whole world.

[Labedev] And, in general, it may generate very dangerous, new kinds of weapons, little known at the moment and even scarcely conceivable by the human imagination. And that, of course, destabilizes the situation. That, in my view, constitutes the main danger of the SDI program. It undermines the main foundation for any possible future accord on strategic offensive weapons and on the whole complex of nuclear weapons -- specifically, the principle of equality and equal security.

[Kolchanov] SDI is, in general, like a many-headed dragon. There are very many really harmful aspects to the program, and we were just talking about the political, military-technical ones, and so forth, but here is another, highly important kind of harm -- the harm that is, as it were, socioeconomic. All these programs, incidentally, inflict damage primarily not on those against whom SDI is being prepared, but on those whom SDI is being prepared to defend -- the Americans temselves. We had visitors at our newspaper from the U.S. PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD, and our colleagues concentrated mainly on the socioeconomic aspects of the program. I shall quote just a few excertps from the remarks made by our U.S. colleagues. Here's what is written, for example: Every $1 billion of capital investment taken out of civilian production in order to develop Star Wars or other weapons systems means the loss of at least 14,000 jobs. The 2-3.5 trillion handed over to the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex will mean the loss over the next 15-20 years of 28-49 million jobs. Iron and steel, engineering and, in general, all kinds of manufacturing industry will suffer most. That's what is written by our colleagues from the U.S. PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD.

[Zholkver] But, you know, it seems to me that, when we talk in this way about just the problems of nuclear and space weapons, the thought may well occur to one: but are the so-called conventional weapons any less dangerous nowadays? After all, it doesn't make much difference to anyone whatever kind of weapons they've died from. And so I must say that the Soviet Union is campaigning just as actively for a reduction in conventional weapons. I was recently in Vienna, where a meeting is being held between the representatives of states taking part in the all-European Conference. Our delegation also submitted proposals about the military aspects of security on the continent of Europe and recalled that, in Budapest, the Warsaw Pact states had tabled absolutely concrete proposals on the subject: in the course of 1-2 years, the numbers of troops in the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would be cut by 100-150,000 on each side, and then, in the early nineties, it is intended to carry out a further reduction in land-based troops and tactical air forces by 25 percent. That is a reduction of half a million men on each side. In other words, there would be 1 million fewer soldiers in Europe.

[Kolchanov] What's more, we are ready to discuss it, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, at various forums -- both at the Vienna meeting, at the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and weapons in Central Europe; and within the framwork of the mandate, as it were, for Stockholm-2, as it's already being called now, which the Vienna meeting now in progress has to draw up; and within the framework of consultations between Warsaw Pact and NATO representatives; and at all forums with the participation both of neutral and of nonaligned countries. It is important to set things in motion.

[Zholkver] I must say that such a position is supported, in general, by states that are by no means just in the European region. I have seen the statement made in Parliament by Rajiv Gandhi, the prime minister of India. It is now taking on particular significance, since, as you know, an announcement has been made about the forthcoming visit to India by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. And, when speaking in Parliament, the Indian prime minister declared that the positive point about the Reykjavik meeting is that both sides came very close to reaching an agreement, even though no solution was actually achieved. And now, Rajiv Gandhi stated, the leadership of the two great powers is required to display wise statesmanship and he plainly declared that the main thing is to guarantee that the Star Wars program does not stand in the way of disarmament.

I remember that speech by the Indian prime minister when I was preparing television material about the sessions of the First Committee of the UN General Assembly. It's now time for decisions there too. Resolutions considered at the session of the General Assembly are being adopted. The vast majority of the resolutions are aimed primarily at curbing the race for nuclear weapons, since they are the most dangerous. I saw some curious statistics here. Twenty-eight resolutions have already been adopted, mainly about these issues: halting nuclear tests, nondeployment of nuclear weapons, reductions in them and the prospects for their total elimination. So, 28 resolutions have been adopted. Only in three cases did the United States find it possible to vote in favor -- on secondary issues, by the way. In four cases, it abstained. Twenty-one times, it voted against, voting seven times in complete isolation, against drafts that had been prepared jointly by both socialist and nonaligned states, including with the participation of a number of capitalist countries. It seems to me that these statistics reflect very vividly the balance of forces in the modern world: the consistent peace-loving policy of the socialist community, and this United States policy of neoglobalism, which manifests itself both in relation to the arms race and in a whole series of regional conflicts.

We will end our roundtable conversation at that point. Thank you, colleagues, for taking part in it. Thank you, comrade listeners, for your attention.

CSCE DELEGATE CRITICIZES U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD

LD161120 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 16 TASS -- The follow-up meeting on security and cooperation in Europe is continuing in Vienna.

Addressing its session, member of the Soviet delegation V. Morozov said that the Soviet delegation intended to concretize the proposal made by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, for holding in Moscow a representative conference of the participating countries on problems of humanitarian cooperation, and submit it for consideration to the Vienna meeting.

He observed that there existed a close interrelationship between peace and humanitarian cooperation, between security and human rights.

Regrettably, the recognition of the right to peace as a basic human right was not reflected in practical deeds of the United States which, through its aggressive policy toward Nicaragua and the Mediterranean, through nuclear explosions in Nevada and the "Star Wars" programme, demonstrated disregard for the human right to peace and, as a consequence, for the right to life.

Morozov said that the Soviet delegation, and Soviet public opinion, were seriously alarmed by the U.S. attempts to evade a serious discussion on human rights, to reduce that important problem to the issue of the emigration of citizens from other CSCE countries.

Soviet public opinion resolutely protested against the violation by the U.S. and some other Western countries of key provisions of the Helsinki Final Act calling for broader familiarization with and understanding of various aspects of the life of other participating nations as a means of strengthening trust among peoples.

The final document of the Madrid follow-up meeting called on all participants, who had not made it so far, to consider the possibility of joining international covenants on human rights, said the Soviet representative.

The U.S., however, failed as yet to respond to this call that had been signed by its representative as well.

"Why did it again place itself in opposition to all other countries participants in the CSCE process?

How can the delegation of a country where 30 million people live below the official poverty line, where there are 15 million jobless and two million homeless and in which various special services maintain 15 files on each American, act as a mentor on questions of human rights?"

AFP Version

AU142116 Paris AFP in English 2103 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna, Nov 14 (AFP) -- The United States and the Soviet Union accused one another of serious human right violations in sharp exchanges at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) here Friday.

Head of the U.S. delegation Warren Zimmermann cited the cases of 36 people "who are victims of this lack of compliance' with the human rights accords in the Helsinki Final Act, signed by 35 countries. In response, Soviet delegation member Vladimir Morozov outlined what he called a "list of gross violations" of human rights in the United States. "How can the delegation of a country where 30 million people live below the official poverty line, where 15 million are jobless and two million homeless, where every American is entered on 15 different files, how can it play the role of mentor in human rights?" he asked.

Mr Zimmermann, who according to wintesses at the closed door session described life inside Soviet camps, raised the issue of those who fought for the right to practise their religion or for the rights of national minorities. He added that the United States recognised that "the picture is not uniformly black," citing the cases of recently released Soviet citizens Yuriy Orlov and Anatoliy Shcharansky. Mr Morozov said he was unhappy at "attempts by the United States to avoid serious discussion on human rights and to reduce this important problem simply to the departure of citizens from other countries."

Head of the Liechtenstein delegation mario von Ledebert-Wicheln called for a minute of silence for "victims of repression," which was refused by the Soviet Union as "inappropriate," reliable sources said.

Kola Missiles Withdrawal Cited

AU141702 Paris AFP in English 1656 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna Nov 14 (AFP) -- The Soviet delegation at the European security conference here Friday rejected allegations that Moscow announced the withdrawal of its medium-range nuclear missiles from the Kola Peninsula in order to divert attention from human rights issues.

Soviet delegate General Viktor Tatarnikov at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) described the claim as "naive and without foundation" in a news conference here. He said the three parts of the CSCE conference -- security, economy and human rights -- "are for us of equal importance."

Soviet number two leader Yegor Ligachev announced in Helsinki Thursday that all medium-range missle launchers in the Kola Peninsula, adjoining Finland, had been dismantled, along with most of launchers in the Leningrad and Baltic military districts.

Yuriy Kashlev, the chief Soviet CSCE delegate, said "the word security" had been missing from CSCE talks and that judging by their statements, several delegations wanted to forget that the Helsinki Final Act was about "security and cooperation."

The 35 signatories of the 1975 accord -- all of Europe except for Albania, plus the United States and Canada -- have just finished the second week of their review of the Helsinki accord.

During full sessions of the conference, which have been held behind closed doors, the U.S., Canadian, Dutch and British delegations have all criticised human rights breaches, said Rudolf Torovsky the Austrian delegation chief.

In a news conference Mr Torovsky said that the Soviet response to these criticisms had been "measured" and that it had seldom used the argument that it was foreign interference in Soviet internal affairs.

At the opening of the CSCE review conference Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze suggested the holding of a human rights conference in Moscow and this was welcomed Thursday by U.S. delegation chief Warren Zimmerman as a "very interesting idea."

Mr Zimmerman said he had detected a certain degree of "unprecedented" openness in contacts with the Soviet delegation.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA CITES TATARNIKOV VIENNA SPEECH

PM141405 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 86 Second Edition p 3

[Text] Vienna, 13 Nov -- Major V.M. Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation, spoke in the discussion that is continuing at the Vienna meeting of representatives of the CSCE states. His speech was devoted to military aspects of security on the European continent.

In the USSR's opinion, he noted, the Vienna meeting is designed to provide the Stockholm conference with a mandate that would enable it to work out accords on reductions in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. The balanced program for European disarmament proposed by the Warsaw Pact states in Budapest is a good basis for this. It encompasses a wide geographical area -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. In the USSR's opinion, it should be phased in.

As a first step a one-time reciprocal reduction in NATO and Warsaw Pact troops of 150-200,000 men could take place over 1-2 years. Subsequently, in the early nineties, there would be further 25 percent reductions in comparison with present levels in ground forces and tactical aircraft. These reductions would amount to over 500,000 people on each side.

Needless to say, thes responsible steps need to be reliably monitored. The socialist countries propose using both national and international means for this purpose, including on-site inspection.

The public in the European countries are concerned at the intensification in tension as a result of the policy being pursued by the NATO countries. The United States and certain NATO countries use various types of propaganda schemes in order to justify the militarization of the European continent. They talk about the "Soviet military threat" while themselves discussing questions of using medium-range missiles to inflict a first strike, as was the case at the 21-22 October NATO Nuclear Planning Group session. They talk about "openness" [otkrytost], but apply the concept solely to ground forces; when it is a question of the navy or air force -- that is, multirole strike weapons and dangerous types of arms -- this openness evaporates. Or take the question of confidence-building measures. It is well known that, despite the measures worked out at Stockholm, the territories of a number of states participating in the European process are still beyond the scope of these measures. It is natural that other participating states which have undertaken far-reaching commitments would not want to remain ignorant of what is happening on those territories. This entire range of questions must be examined in detail at the following stage of the Stockholm conference.

In the Soviet Union's opinion, the questions of strengthening security and ensuring disarmament concern all Europeans and require corresponding status. That is why the USSR calls on the participants in the Vienna meeting to work persistently in all avenues of the Final Act without exception.

CONTINUING COMMENTS ON U.S. ARMS TO IRAN

Growing Scandal

LD162121 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Nov 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] [Kalyagin] The policy of the present Washington administration is not infrequently dubbed as unpredictable. The United States continues to surprise unpleasantly even its own allies. This is also confirmed by another political scandal involving the delivery of U.S. weapons to Iran. Let us recall that since the people's revolution in Iran, which overthrew the Shah's regime, the U.S. policy towards that country has been of an adventurist nature. The inglorious failure of the U.S. assault landing in Iran remains in the memory, and now another assault has become common knowledge, although it is true it is of a somewhat different nature.

The former assistant to the U.S. President for National Security Affairs, McFarlane, secretly visited Tehran. He did not fly in empty-handed. He smuggled in spare parts for U.S. airplanes which are the basis of the Iranian air force. Apart from military equipment, McFarlane took with him a cake as a present, in the form of a key. This was a symbol of sorts. With the aid of the dispatched presents it was proposed to open the door leading to the restoration of U.S. positions in Iran. However, it would have been more logical to make a cake shaped not as a key, but as a skeleton-key. After all, the whole operation was of an illegal and dishonest nature: the United States professed its total neutrality in the Iran-Iraq conflict, offficial Washington announced that it had imposed a ban on the export of any military equipment to Iran and demanded the same from its allies. Now it becomes clear that the United States has for 18 months been secretly delivering arms to Iran. These deliveries were carried out with the help of Israel. They were accomplished both by air and by sea; this was confirmed in particular by the Danish sailors who were on the vessel which set off from the Israeli port of Elat to Iran. On board it had 26 containers with U.S. munitions. All these disclosures have had the effect of a bombshell within the United States itself.

[Dunayev] In America they usually find a justification for any scandal, but at the moment they can't, try as they might. At first the President and his team counted on sitting out the storm and waiting for it to stop, but in 10 days it has gathered such strength that they have started writing about the wind of Watergate here, the wind of the largest scandal in the whole of U.S. history which cost Nixon the post of president. Explanations were needed, and namely from the President himself, and on Thursday evening Ronald Reagan hastily organized a television address -- they literally announced it an hour before, this was done in a hurry. It must be said that many people here hoped that the news emanating from the Near East would not be confirmed, that the President would be able to dispel it. Anybody but Reagan, the observers said, could have supplied Iran with weapons in exchange for U.S. hostages. Precisely now several U.S. and Israeli businessmen have appeared in court accused of illegally and secretly sending weapons to Iran -- did the President really do the same, in like illegal and secret fashion?

The thrust of the President's 15-minute television address consisted of the following:

It turns out that his administration supplied Iran with weapons not for the sake of exchanging them for hostages, or to split the leadership in Iran, or for the war with Iraq which Iran is waging with U.S. weapons, since it got them from the time of the Shah and for which it desperately needs spare parts, but everything was done, as the President maintained, because of Iran's geography, because of the fact that its neighbor is the Soviet Union. This country, our country, the Soviet Union, in the President's version, threatens Iran, and so what was there left for the poor United States to do except to quickly set up an arms bridge. Suddenly the Americans may believe it. After all, it is not the first time here in Washington that they have tried to transfer their sins onto the Russians.

But meticulous observers immediately noted at this point: Why do all this secretly? As is known, Washington supplies weapons, and supplies weapons openly to countries which border with the Soviet Union, and what is more, it even supplies them to subversives antigovernmental forces, as in Afghanistan, for example, and is not ashamed of it. Here we suddenly have such shyness. In his address the President emphasized that he supplied Iran only with defensive weapons, and here one immediately recalls his Strategic Defensive Initiative -- you know, he has taken up all-round defense!

Judging by the response from the press and congress -- where, by the way, hearings will begin next Friday, 25 November in a commission on the legality of the operation which the President carried out -- so, judging by the first response, the President's address did not make an impression on politicians and Congressmen here in the U.S. capital. Speaker of the House of Representatives, O'Neill, said that it must be investigated in Congress -- the President's address did not explain anything. Congressmen Les Aspin, the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said that he thinks a very big error has been made. The ABC television company White House correspondent, Sam Donaldson, said the following: The President went through a minefield during his address. If Carter were the president now, the process of impeachment, that is removal from power, would have already been started against him.

[Kalyagin] The scandal around the secret U.S. arms supplies is growing. Many are asking a reasonable question: How can one trust an administration which says one thing and does the very opposite? The point here is of a major foreign policy failure by Washington which one doubts that they'll be able to suppress.

Dunayev: 'New Watergate' Shown

LD141502 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Vladimir Dunayev report from New York]

[Excerpts] People are talking about a new Watergate in Washington today. This is not only in the corridors, as I heard it earlier in the week, but on the pages of the capital's most respectable newspaper, THE WASHINGTON POST. [passage omitted] The admissions of U.S. President Reagan at a meeting with Congress leaders -- the meeting was behind closed doors, but its contents were leaked to the press -- to the effect that, (?bypassing) Congress, the State Department and even the CIA arms have more than once been supplied to Iran, have astounded many here. The present action is close to the biggest scandal of the postwar United States, Watergate, not only by the scale of the scandal, and of the White House attempts to cover it up at any cost, but also by the methods used. [passage omitted]

Much resembles or repeats Watergate, but something is even worse: Now it is not the case of two political parties in the United States (?spying on each other), but there are now cowboy raids in the international arena, and furthermore in deep secret. The time has come to ask President Reagan whether he can have control over the military, as THE WASHINGTON POST writes. It continues: An inevitable reply to this is: No, he cannot. Politicians and journalists are angry with the administration, not because the foreign policy is dangerous, unpredictable, imperial, but because there was no need to get caught! This is why they are angry. By the time the new Congress convenes -- this will be in January -- the threat to carry out investigations which can now be heard will be forgotten, the more so because the thread also leads to the undeclared war against Nicaragua, the [word indistinct] of Libya, the attack on Grenada -- all this has been prepared by the same military from the National Security Council.

While the latest affair, arms supplies to Iran, is being examined and even condemned by the press, other operations are taboo, prohibited topics.

PRAVDA Criticism

PM142151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russians 15 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Gan Washington dispatch: "The Secret Comes Out"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Nov -- President Reagan admitted when speaking on national television that the United States had been making arms deliveries to Iran but "in modest quantities."

Clumsily skirting round the "sharp corners," Reagan relied mainly on unconcealed demagoguery. If he is to be believed then, in weaving a plot against Iran, the United States, it transpires, was guided by the most "noble" intentions, namely, of promoting... a cessation of the war between Iran and Iraq.

With reference to U.S. officials, sources in Congress, and "informed Israelis," THE WASHINGTON POST writes that the White House wanted to renew contacts with pro-American elements in Iran and also to "establish new channels to Tehran with the aid of the Iranian emigre community and America's allies." Tel Aviv was plugged into the business, having a broad network of agents in Iran. Circumventing existing U.S. laws, the White House undertook deliveries of weapons to Iran thereby counting on buying influence among its military.

In his speech, Reagan took responsibility, declaring that he personally had sanctioned the military deliveries to Iran. "My aim was to convince Tehran that our representatives were acting with my sanction." In the words of the President, these deliveries were allegedly limited merely to "batches of defensive weapons and spare parts." However, THE WASHINGTON POST points out, "other officials said that they probably included ground-to-air missiles, antitank weapons, and spare parts for the American F-14 fighters with which Iran is armed."

It is worth stating that all these machinations were performed behind the back not only of the U.S. Congress, but also of the competent federal departments.

In a nutshell, with the President's "blessing" a narrow group of administration staffers did everything it deemed necessary to lay, as it was expressed by a "senior official of the administration" who had begged journalists not to name him, "the foundation for relations with Iran in the event of the replacement of Khomeyni's government with a more moderate regime." Laws, morals, and the norms of international law were not taken into account.

In his speech, Reagan sought to cover all this international gangsterism with peacemaking arguments, counting, it is to be supposed, on a naive and uninformed audience. To justify the United States' hegemonistic schemes regarding Iran and the whole region of the Near East and Southwest Asia, the President put forward an altogether fantastic "argument" declaring that the United States was saving "Iran" from... "Soviet domination." However, he himself immediately let slip the true motives for the subersive operation. "The oil reserves of Iran," he observed, "play an important role for the long-term health of the economy" of the West. Reagan thereby confirmed a well known fact, the U.S. Near East policy is permeated with oil. However, it also contains a "Soviet factor." Alluding to its sources in the White House, THE WASHINGTON POST notes: "It is declared that Reagan also hopes that the United States will ultimately be able to restore its electronic eavesdropping stations in Iran for the surveillance of Soviet missile installations."

IZVESTIYA Comments

PM142051 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Blinov dispatch "The White House Secret Kitchen"]

[Text] Washington -- The U.S. Adminstration is trying in every way to suppress the scandal which has been caused by the unexpected publicity which its attempts to establish secret contacts "with the moderate wing" of the Iranian leadership and to organize secret deliveries of weapons and military hardware to Iran have received.

On Thursday President Reagan, who had until then refrained from public statements, tried to justify these actions. In his speech which was broadcast on U.S. television, he expressed displeasure with the fact that for 10 days the international and U.S. press had published "rumors" about the White House steps regarding Iran -- rumors which were unfavorable to the administration. Forced to explain the administration's actions, Reagan said that for the past 18 months the White House had been implementing a "secret diplomatic initiative." In his words this initiative was aimed at the "restoration of relations with Iran" and even at ..."ending, in a dignified manner, the 6-year bloody war betwen Iran and Iraq."

The President did not go into detail as to how he had hoped to achieve an end to the Iran-Iraq war. In his speech he also failed to mention such important aspects of the White House's secret diplomacy as using Israel in the role of mediator and the question of linkage between arms deliveries and the hostage problem.

The explanations furnished by the U.S. President drew skeptical remarks from a number of politicians and press organs. Thus Senator R. Byrd, the Democratic leader in the Senate, declared that the President's speech failed to satisfy him. Many questions have remained unanswered, he said in an interviw with the ABC network.

Meanwhile the U.S. newspapers continue to publish information exposing the mechanism of the White House's secret diplomacy. [paragraph continues]

It emerges from this that the National Security Council was assigned a central role in playing the White House's secret gambit regarding Iran. This body, which is directly subordinated to the President is not answerable to Congressional committees, while its leader -- The President's assistant for national security affairs -- is not confirmed by the Senate as is the case, for instance, with cabinet secretaries. In accordance with its status, the National Security Council is merely required to give recommendations to the President and to coordinate the activities of departments in the appropriate sphere. However, under President Reagan, the National Security Council has begun not only to coordinate, but also to independently carry out the most sensitive [ostryy] secret operations and has in essense become a state within a state. Thus, over the past year the National Security Council has taken charge of operations for supplying Nicaraguan "contras" with weapons in circumvention of U.S. legislation. Questions from a number of congressional bodies concerning the actions of the National Security Council were rejected by the White House which alluded to "the privilege of executive power."

It was precisely the National Security Council that initiated the U.S. secret operations regarding Iran.

The direct leadership of the operation was exercised initially by R. McFarlane who occupied the post of Presidential Assistant for national security affairs. After he left this post his successor, J. Poindexter began to exercise overall leadership, while Marine Lieutenant Colonel O. North, deputy director of the National Security Council's military political bureau, dealt with specific issues.

As THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, in the opinion of congressmen, foreign policy experts, and officials of the administration, the interference by staffers of the National Security Council in operations of a semimilitary nature represents "a fundamental change in its traditional role."

In the assessment of the well known journalists R. Evans and R. Novak, the National Security Council under the leadership of McFarlane and Poindexter has been transformed into "a powerful instrument for conducting policy" and has played the part of a kind of "shadow CIA" in the White House's Iranian affair. "They have gone far further than the national Security Council has previously done" said NEW YORK TIMES correspondent David Aaron, who occupied the post of deputy assistant to the President for National security affairs under President Carter.

Continued Contacts Criticized

NC151304 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Igor Sheftunov commentary]

[Text] The world public has focused its attention on a scandal resulting from revelations last week about clandestine visits by U.S. Administration representatives to Iran. Following the lead of Lebanon's AL-SHIRA' weekly, the world press has published comments on the secret visit by Robert McFarlane, President Reagan's former security adviser, and by other representatives of the Washington administration to Iran. Hojjat ol-Eslam Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly, had to admit that McFarlane's visit to Tehran had taken place. President Reagan and his present national security adviser, Poindexter, also admitted that representatives of the U.S. Administration have been paying secret visits to Iran for the past 18 months.

Washington wants to assure that these visits were aimed at discussing the export of U.S. arms to Iran and facilitating the release of American hostages. At the same time, it resorts to all possible means to hide the true objective of the visits. This major and basic objective is the implementation of the confidential program of intensifying the activities of pro-American forces in Iran. The Washington administration drew up this program in a plot engineered with Israel, and it is trying to expand and strengthen its network of agents in Iran, which after the Shah's downfall have been acting clandestinely. U.S. allies with close contacts with Iran, primarily Pakistan, are used to achieve this end. Last Monday, Lebanon's AL-SAFIR reported that supporters of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi's crown prince have been established in Pakistan under the auspices of U.S. militarists and General Ziaul Haq's regime. Among these the group of General Oveysi, the Shah's general who was justly dubbed by Iranians as the Tehran Executioner, is very active. Members of these groups receive special training under the leadership of American, Israeli, and Pakistani instructors and are then sent to Iran. As all incidents indicate, the conclusion reached in Washington is that the time is right to try to bring their puppets to power in Iran. They are very hopeful that the Iran-Iraq war of attrition, which is in its 7th year, has weakened both sides and their economies and has created an oil crisis, which is both countries' major source of revenue. Washington is trying to exploit the situation as much as possible to impose its support for Iran. A CBS correspondent who interviewed Reagan said after the interview that those groups in Iran that make Iran's rapprochement with the United States possible, or, more simply, make Iran subject to Washington's will, can depend on the U.S. Administration's financial and military assistance.

It is not the first time that McFarlane, who recently paid a secret visit to Tehran, has been assigned a special secret mission to Iran. A former colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps, McFarlane was directly involved 6 years ago in the landing in Tabas of U.S. commandos by helicopters based on U.S. aircraft carriers. This landing was to be signal for the monarchists and other pro-U.S. groups to commence operations aimed at gaining power. As you know, this operation failed from the outset, and the commandos had to flee Iran quickly.

Recently the White House decided to send McFarlane on a confidential mission to Iran. But his trip was, to Washington's surprise, widely reported. As a result, an international scandal and commotion arose. Nevertheless, Washington is not thinking of giving up. White House spokesmen have said that President Reagan has decided to continue secret contacts with Iran, and Poindexter has stressed the importance of these contacts, saying that they should be kept secret so that Washington can expand and preserve its contacts with American sympathizers in Iran.

The policy of plotting and harsh intervention in Iran's domestic affairs pursued by Washington continues.

Kudrin Quotes Participants

LD141955 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 14 Oct 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] At last, following 10 days of contradictory polemics and all kinds of rumor and embarrassment, President Reagan admitted that the United States has carried out arms deliveries to Iran -- but in modest amounts, he said.

At the same time the President denied reports of any deal with the kidnappers of the U.S. hostages in Lebanon. Addressing the surprised U.S. people on television, the President set forth a highly original argument to justify deliveries of arms to a country that is at war with Iraq. The administration has more than once proclaimed its strict neutrality in that 6-year war, and now it has come up with a new argument: In sending arms to Iran, the United States is striving to promote an end to the conflict.

It further emerges that as long as 1 and 1/2 years ago the President signed a secret directive, called by Reagan a secret diplomatic initiative vis-a-vis Iran. The head of the White House has admitted that the initiative, including the supply of arms to Iran, aimed to gain some access and influence within Iran, as well as in Iraq.

With this goal in view, the supply of arms to Iran was sanctioned, as were the secret talks with Robert McFarlane. With whom precisely the Washington emissary, a former national security adviser, was in touch, the President did not say. But he hastened to say that McFarlane's action was fully within the limits of U.S. law. McFarlane himself stated that he flew to the 4-day talks under his own name, not under an Irish passport, as the press asserted.

Reagan spoke as if no U.S. arms had been supplied to Iran, either directly from the United States, or via other states. However, in enumerating some countries which, according to reports which have appeared, could have acted as intermediaries in U.S. military deliveries, he did not mention Israel. It is precisely from Israel that the biggest shipments of U.S. arms have been made to Iran. Yesterday this was indirectly admitted by Rabin, the defense minister, himself -- if our greatest friend requests special favors, we provide them. These are the words of Rabin, the Israeli defense minister. How can one fail to agree with THE NEW YORK TIMES, which says that the White House has committed many blunders in this operation?

Immediately after the President's televised address, Thomas O'Neill, the speaker of the House of Representatives, stated that he had advised Hamilton, the chairman of the House of Representatives' intelligence committee to begin an urgent investigation into the methods and goals of the present administration's policies

Sailors and airmen, direct participants in operations to deliver arms to Iran, have also begun to speak out. They adduce various facts and reveal a variety of details. But their testimony has one thing in common: that the operations took place -- in an atmosphere of secrecy and deception, if you like -- but take place they did.

Over the past 6 years our ships have made more than 60 voyages to Iran with cargoes of U.S. armaments -- of course they were camouflaged, admits the vice chairman of the Danish seamens' union Henrik Berlau. Herman Duran, an American pilot from Florida, worked for International Air Tours, an airline, and in 1985 he regularly flew from Israel to the Iranian town of Tabriz, via Spain. He said: I was told I was carrying medicines and potatoes. I had no idea that the operation was secret, said another. What sort of airline is International Air Tours? It appears to be registered in Nigeria, but it belongs to a private Israeli joint-stock company. Dick Welman is the proprietor of another company, an American one this time -- International Airlines. He used to fly from the United States to Israel and on to Iran with a cargo of Hawk missiles designed for use against aircraft and anti-tank rockets -- all of U.S. manufacture.

Eventually Welman sold a transport aircraft to an Israeli company based in Nigeria. The handover of the aircraft took palce on Dutch territory, and was carried out by the pilot Herman Duran.

Turkatenko Views Aim of Sales

LD142022 Moscow TASS in English 2005 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 14 TASS — TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

In his remarks on American television on Thursday, President Reagan admitted that the USA had delivered weapons to Iran, but he claimed that those were "modest deliveries."

The President advanced a ridiculous argument in an attempt to justify arms supplies to a coutnry, which is at war with Iraq, albeit vis-a-vis the latter the U.S. Administration has more than once proclaimed its "strick neutrality." By supplying arms to Iran, the President said, the USA thus wishes to contribute. . . to bringing an end to the Iran-Iraq war.

It turns out that for almost a year and half now, as the President said, the USA "has had underway a secret diplomatic initiative to Iran," Reagan frankly admitted that that "Initiative," including arms supplies to Iran, was designed to "gain some degree of acess and influence within Iran — as well as Iraq." It is precisely with that aim that the President, as he himself said, sanctioned arms shipments to Iran and secret talks with the people the USA maintained contacts. The President preferred not to specify with whom precisely such contacts were maintained and not to say to whom specifically the American weapons were shipped. This passing over in silence of the facts is proof that Washington has clearly set out to ensure for itself the possiblity for meddling in Iran's home affairs.

Unnamed high-ranking representatives of the administration, as the UPI Agency said, made explicit statements on that score. The agency quotes them as saying that the President signed a secret directive in January which is a deviation from the policy proclaimed towards Iran and sanctioning arms supplies to Iran in the interests of the USA, with the aim of winning the favours of moderates in Iran. In other words, stake is placed on pro-American circles in that country. Yet, to be precise, the point at issue is not only interference in Iran's affairs. Judging by the President's remarks the "secret initiative" pursues by far more ambitious aims. It is not for nothing that he stressed Iran's "critical geography," i.e. its strategically advantageous position and the fact that both Iran and the Middle East countries neighbouring on it have oil reserves.

The President refuted press reports to the effect that American weapons had been shipped to Iran via other countries. Yet in quoting these reports the President failed to mention among such countries Israel, while it is precisely from Israel that, according to newspapers, big supplies of American weapons to Iran were made.

To justify the hegemonistic designs of the USA vis-a-vis Iran and the whole Middle East and southwest Asian region, the President put forward the fantastic "argument" saying that the USA was saving Iran from. . . "Soviet domination."

Yet in real fact the objectives of Washington's strategy in those regions have long been an open secret. By shipping weapons to Iran, Washington has set out to meddle directly in the Iran-Iraq war in order to prevent its ending, since, in the first place, this war weakens both countries, and, second, undermines the positions of the Arab world in the fight against the Israeli aggression.

The UPI Agency stressed that Reagan's address on TV was arranged for by the White House in such a manner as to isolate him from representatives of the press and public. Thus the President was guarded against "inconvenient" questions and the need to give answers to them. Yet, it is clear already now, that his admissions and fantastic claims will hardly bring down the wave of criticism against the U.S. Administration over its policy on Iran, including in the USA itself. Right after the President's television address, Thomas O'Neill, the speaker of the U.S. Congress, said that he advised Lee Hamilton, chairman of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, to inquire urgently into the methods and aims of that policy.

COMMENTARIES HIT U.S. SANCTIONS AGAINST SYRIA

Attempt to 'Distract Public'

LD142206 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1902 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS) -- TASS commentator Leonid Lapin writes:

The White House has announced a number of economic sanctions against Syria. In particular, the decision has been made to substantially reduce the American Embassy's staff in Damascus, not to return its ambassador there (he was recently demonstratively recalled to Washington), and to introduce restrictions on trade with Syria, especially on deliveries of spare parts for civil aviation equipment and computers.

Formally the anti-Syrian measures have been taken in the framework of the so-called "campaign of combating terrorism," which as we know is being used by Washington as a cover for the campaign against progressive regimes and movements. They are a direct consequence of the judicial farce which has ended in London, during which Syria was accused of "complicity in terrorism." As we know, relying on the decisions of this "court" the West European allies of the United States had earlier introduced their own sanctions against that Middle Eastern country.

However, as observers point out, the real aims of the anti-Syrian demarche go far beyond the framework of the notorious "anti-terrorist campaign." Above all, it comprises an attempt by Washington to give a fresh boost to the campaign of whipping up hatred and mistrust toward other countries and peoples and in this way to distract the attention of the public from pressing questions of nuclear disarmament, the solution to which is obstructed by the White House's militaristic course, to get the United States out of the international isolation into which it was driven by the administration's destructive position at Reykjavik, and to dampen mounting murmurings in the Atlantic Alliance.

The UP agency in particular noted that the long-promised announcement of sanctions against Syria was specially timed for the arrival of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on a visit to the United States.

This is the first meeting of the leaders of the two countries since the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik, where the United States, trying to reach military superiority by means of the "Star Wars" program; wrecked the opportunity opened up by the Soviet Union to embark on far-reaching measures for the limitation and liquidation of nuclear weapons. Publicly demonstrating its "solidarity with London," which has of late been acting in the unedifying role of ringleader of the anti-Syrian campaign, the White House obviously expects that the guest, who has been accorded so much respect, will be obliged to reply in kind and not place the matter of the White House in an aukward position on the questions on which his position is especially vulnerable, especially in connection with the Reykjavik meeting.

As for the official pretest for the sanctions against Syria -- its imagined involvement in "international terrorism" -- this, in the words of THE WASHINGTON TIMES, French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac in an interview to that paper the other day declared that he considered the London trial and the accusations made there against Syria to be a provocation by Israeli intelligence aimed at discrediting the Syrian leadership.

Even in the eyes of the U.S. allies the White House's attempts to pose as an uncompromising "fighter against terrorism" looks clumsy and comic against the background of a scandal that is rocking America. This is caused by the exposures in the press of a secret operation by the White House to interfere in the Iran-Iraq conflict by means of arms deliveries to Iran, which the U.S. Administration also has on its "black list" of states aiding and abetting terrorism. This scandal testifies that in its actions in the international arena Washington is certainly not guided by principles of lofty morality, as it would like to convince the world, but by imperial designs, which do not hinder it, in the event, from entering into contact even with the most evil enemies.

Kulik Raps U.S. 'Allegations'

LD151705 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- TASS Political News Analyst Sergey Kulik writes:

The so-called "list of terrorist incidents" has been issued by the U.S. Department of State the other day. What it contains, however, are not facts but allegations aimed at proving something that cannot be proved: that it is Syria that is now the centre of international terrorism. The State Department even invented a figure -- 500. In the opinion of the State Department as many people were killed the world over with "malicious intent" of Damascus since 1983.

Alleging that Syrian leaders are "terrorists", Washington tries in vain for the umpteenth time to distract the attention of the world public from its own piratic policies in the world arena. And if a list of its terroristic acts be drawn up, the number of victims would be counted by thousands, hundreds of thousands, or even millions.

And the facts on that list would be real, undoubted ones.

It should be recalled that 40 thousand counter-revolutionaries are trained every year on U.S. funds to be used against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. And everyone of them is held duty-bound to kill "at least" ten persons.

No less than 35 thousand peaceful people were killed by CIA-financed "contras" in Nicaragua against which, as the authoritative international court in the Hague established, the Reagan administration is waging an undeclared war.

The damage to Angola's economy from actions of UNITA gangs which are also financed by the USA is estimated at 12 billion dollars. Anti-Mozambican terrorists from MNR whom leaders of the "Heritage Foundation", Ronald Reagan's associates, now intend for the "Maputo government", inflicted damage on the Mozambican national economy which can be estimated at no less than five billion dollars. Terrorist drove tens of thousands of African peasants out of their native areas, left them without means of subsistance, without shelter, deprived them of relatives and kin.

It is impossible to name all the victims of this criminal policy. But Indira Gandhi's killers were members of a group of terrorists. They underwent training at one of the special camps in the U.S. territory. Patrice Lumumba, Salvador Allende, Omar Torrijos, Maurice Bishop, Orlando Letelier, Aldo Moro, Arnulfo Romero are among political and religious leaders in whose murder the CIA is involved.

Facts show irrefutably that it is precisely Washington that wages undeclared wars against whole nations, stages political assassinations, and though the demagogy of politicos and ideologists of imperialism is nothing surprising, still one cannot but marvel at Washington's cynical attempts to try to justify the flouting of elementary standards of morality and civilised life and to blame its fault on others.

REAGAN SIGNS NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

LD150942 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 15 TASS -- President Reagan on Friday signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 that had been endorsed by the Congress. In a statement circulated by the White House in this connection the President stated he is "particularly pleased" with the fact that the Congress has endorsed appropriations for continued build-up of the U.S. military might, above all strategic offensive arms.

The act, specifically, envisages appropriations for the construction of 12 more MX inter-continental first-strike ballistic missiles and the continuation of the development of the new "Midgetman" nuclear ballistic missile. The act has the provisions to fully fund the request for the manufacture of cruise missiles and the new "Stealth" strategic bomber.

The act also sanctions serial production of the new generation of lethal chemical arms -- so-called binary ammunition. The President, however, expressed "disappointment" with some other provisions in tha act. He said he is "troubled" by the congressional decision that the funding levels requested initially by the administration for the "Star Wars" programme be reduced by 34 percent and concerned over a ban on ASAT testing against objects in space that will operate for one year.

CHINESE ACROBATS ARRIVE IN LENINGRAD 13 NOV

OW141250 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] The members of China's Shandong acrobatic troupe arrived in Leningrad on 13 November. They will give performances in Moscow. The Chinese acrobats toured Leningrad City and visited various places that have something to do with the Great October Revolution. In the evening, they watched "(?The Wild Geese)," a short drama adopted from (?Uzov's) modern drama. On the next day, they will meet with members of Leningrad's acrobatic troupe.

MOSCOW RADIO NOTES RUSSIAN ART SHOW IN PRC

OW121039 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 11 Nov 86

[Text] A Soviet exhibition of images of modern people in Soviet plastic arts opened in the Chinese capital on Monday. Displayed are 85 paintings and 23 sculptures by Soviet artists. Chinese Vice Culture Minister Gao Zhanxiang and Soviet Ambassador to China Troyanoskiy were present at the opening ceremony. The paintings and sculptures will also be shown in Shanghai after the exhibition in Beijing ends.

The art exhibition is being held in accordance with the 1986-87 plan on cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and China. Cultural exchanges between the two countries have witnessed a marked increase in recent years. The Soviet Union regards this as an important component in the general trend to improve bilateral relations.

COMMENTARY VIEWS ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH PRC

OW131302 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Ivanov commentary on Soviet-Chinese Economic and technological cooperation in recent years]

[Text] Experts of the state-run Mine Designing Joint Company in Leningrad returned from China not long ago. Their greatest achievement -- economic theory and technology for building a large opencut coal mine in northeast China -- was approved by the Chinese side. The Soviet experts were satisfied with this. The mine construction engineers from Leningrad proposed a series of unique economic and technological programs to relevant departments in China. For instance, they proposed that a new method of excavating coal in opencut mines be adopted. This method mainly involves the use of a Soviet-made excavator capable of excavating a few thousand cubic meters of coal seams per hour. It has been decided that this method will be used at the (Yininhe) coal mine not far from Hailar City. This is one of the 24 large industrial projects to be built or renovated with Soviet aid and will play an important role in the fulfillment of China's Seventh 5-Year Plan.

An agreement in this respect was signed between the Soviet Union and China last year when Chinese Vice Premier Yao Yilin visited Moscow. Chinese has known the Soviet Mine Designing Joint Company for a long time. Cooperation between it and various Chinese organizations began soon after the founding of the People's Republic of China. In the 1950's mine designing experts from Leningrad enthusiastically took part in building China's 23 coal mines.

Since the 1960's, cooperation between the two countries began to dwindle and remained stagnant for a long time, but this was not the fault of the Soviet Union.

In the past few years great changes have taken place in Soviet-Chinese relations. Economic ties and trade between the two countries have increased steadily. As was pointed out in Comrade Gorbachev's Vladivostok speech on 28 July this year, history has entrusted a particularly important mission to the Soviet and Chinese people. The development of the world depends to a great extent on the two largest socialist countries.

MOSCOW RADIO VIEWS PRC INDUSTRIAL PROJECT AID

OW120158 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 11 Nov 86

[by Station Observer]

[Excerpts] Twenty-seven years ago, in November 1959, China's first tractor plant -- Luoyang tractor Plant -- went into operation. On this, our observer made the following comments:

The 1950's witnessed many shining samples of effective and mutually beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. During that period, China built more than 250 large industrial enterprises and other economic projects with Soviet economic and technological assistance. The Luoyang tractor plant was one of the major results of Soviet-China cooperation. This plant, together with other industrial enterprises built with Soviet aid, has faithfully served the needs of the Chinese people for about 30 years. [passage omitted]

Contacts between the Soviet Union and China have continued to expand in recent years. Leaders and political activists of both countries have met with each other from time to time. Delegations have been exchanged frequently, not only in the economic field but also in the cultural, sports, scientific, technologies, and other areas. In the summer of last year When Chinese Vice Premier Yao Yilin visited Moscow, an agreement was signed between the two countries on economic and technological cooperation in building and renovating industrial projects in China. According to the agreement, the Soviet Union will help China build 7 new industrial projects and renovate 17 large industrial projects constructed in the 1950's with Soviet aid. Among the renovation projects are the Anshan, Baotou, and Wuhan iron and steel plants, the Luoyang bearing plant, and the Luoyang tractor plant. The Soviet Union will supply the Luoyang plants with necessary equipment, and Soviet experts will be responsible for installing and adjusting the equipment.

JAPANESE DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER VISITS MOSCOW

Meets With Shevardnadze

LD142051 Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS — Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, has received today Japan's Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Shinichi Yanai, who is currently in Moscow in connection with the holding of consultations between the foreign ministries of the two countries at the level of deputy foreign ministers.

Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out the pressing need for the efforts of all states in the interests of strengthening peace, nuclear disarmament and preventing a militarization of outer space, the importance of their broad interaction so as to strengthen the fundamentals of international security.

He pointed out that the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik had been a major milestone, the results of that meeting marking important advances in mankind's progress towards non-nuclear world, accord with the interests of all states, all peoples. The settlement of the most important problem of the present -- nuclear disarmament has for the first time begun assuming a real shape. Yet, the stubborn wish of the U.S. side to sacrifice the elimination of nuclear weapons to the militaristic SDI programme, which is designed to ensure military superiority through the creation and placing of space strike weapons in near-earth space, is an obstacle on the way towards implementation of the agreement. The governments, which have decided to participate in that programme, should realize well their responsibility for the consequences for the destinies of the world and international security, which are involved in the militarisation of outer space. This, as was stressed, also concerns the Government of Japan.

The view was expressed of considerable potentialities for Soviet-Japanese cooperation in the context of a broad programme for strengthening peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region, which was put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostok on July 28.

Eduard Shevardnadze reaffirmed the Soviet Union's policy of developing goodneighbourly relations with Japan and stressed the importance of mutual efforts in that direction. A radical turn towards better in Soviet-Japanese relations would serve the best interests of both countries, the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and in the Asian-Pacific region as a whole. Concrete results can be achieved if the sides realistically appraise the situation, approach relations as a complex, rather than put forward any preliminary conditions and create artificial linkages in the development of some or other trends of mutually beneficial bilateral ties.

Shinichi Yanai said that the Japanese Government intends to broaden and raise the level of the dialogue with the Soviet Union. He set forth Japan's stand on some international issues and on questions pertaining to bilateral relations.

Holds Talks With Kapitsa

LD151230 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- Consultations between Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Mihail Kapitsa and Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Shinichi Yanai were held with the participation of groups of experts from both sides in Moscow on November 13-14.

During the consultations, the sides exchanged views on a broad range of topical international and regional problems, and discussed questions of Soviet-Japanese relations.

It was agreed to hold the next round of consultations between the foreign ministries of the USSR and Japan in Tokyo next year at a date to be fixed by the sides.

'BROAD MASSES' OPPOSED TO SDI PARTICIPATION

OW131432 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 11 Nov 86

[Pavel Potapov Dispatch]

[Text] Broad masses of people in Japan are opposed to their country's participation in the U.S. Star Wars plan. Our Tokyo correspondent Pavel Potapov has filed the following report:

Since the Cabinet adopted the decision on Japan's participation in the SDI program on 9 September, the Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] has markedly intensified a propaganda campaign to justify this decision. The LDP asserts that Japan's participation in the SDI program does not conflict with the Diet resolution calling for peaceful use of space, and that the decision of the government and the LDP enjoys extensive support among the people.

Facts, however, significantly contradict the LDP's assertion. This observation is supported by recent developments. The government decision had the effect of adding fuel to the anti-SDI movement that had been gathering strength. Presently, not only opposition parties and antiwar groups but many scientists and public figures as well are opposing the dangerous LDP policy.

In the past several weeks, more than 6,000 people including scientists and engineers of major science and technology organizations signed resolutions and appeals against Japan's participation in the SDI plan. This reporter met the other day Mr Minoru Kitamura, a leading member of the Scientists Council of Japan. He had this to say: First of all, it should be pointed out that Japanese scientists believe that their research should be one for peace. The SDI plan seeks to use Japanese scientific and technological capabilities for military purposes. It extends nuclear arms race to space. We, therefore, are opposed to the U.S. strategical concept itself as well as to Japan's participation in the SDI plan. There are other reasons, too, for our decision to rise in a struggle against the Star Wars plan. The United States is attempting to obtain and monopolize Japanese technologies, high technologies in the electronics area in particular, within the framework of the SDI plan. As a result, Japan will be unable to make use of the results of research. This will certainly be a heavy blow to Japanese science organizations. The day after the government announced its decision on the participation in the SDI program, we issued a statement protesting the decision, noting that Japan's participation is not in the interest of our country which experienced the horror of nuclear arms.

SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES BANGLADESH ENVOY 11 NOV

PM131451 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 86 First Edition page 4

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, foreign minister of the USSR, on 11 November received Mir Mohammad Rezaul Karim, ambassador of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the USSR, at the latter's request.

The ambassador said that martial law was lifted in Bangladesh on November 10 and the constitution was reenacted.

Shevardnadze expressed satisfaction with the restoration of democratic norms and wished success to the people and the Government of Bangladesh in social development.

The talks also centered on some issues pertaining to Soviet-Bangladesh relations.

Shevardnadze called the ambassador's attention to the situation evolving in the world following the Reykjavik meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, U.S. President, and also to the need to step up the campaign for peace and nuclear disarmament.

SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES INDIAN AMBASSADOR 11 NOV

LD112018 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 11 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS — Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, today received the ambassador of the Republic of India to the USSR, Triloki Nath Kaul.

They discussed Soviet-Indian relations and some key problems of the present-day international situation.

Special stress was laid on the high importance of close, trust-based contacts existing between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India. Emphasis was made also on their big personal contributions to developing friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India.

Both sides reaffirmed a desire to further consolidate and broaden Soviet-Indian cooperation and improve the two countries' interaction on the international scene in the interests of strengthening general security and creating a nuclear-free world.

The meeting passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

TALKS, PROTOCOL WITH INDIAN MINISTER CONCLUDED

LD131127 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 13 TASS -- A protocol on trade between India and the Soviet Union for 1987 has been signed here. The protocol envisages an almost six-percent increase in the volume of Indian-Soviet trade as compared with the current year.

During the just-concluded talks in Delhi between the delegations of the Indian Ministry of Commerce and the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, the two sides expressed satisfaction with the fact that, notwithstanding the unfavourable world market situation, they managed to attain objectives in broadening bilateral trade. The two sides emphasised that the newly-signed Indian-Soviet protocol on trade would promote further strengthening of the traditional ties between the two countries.

"India and the USSR have a solid foundation for further expansion of trade-and-economic cooperation", V.P. Shiv Shankar, Indian minister of commerce, has said at a meeting with the Soviet trade delegation. "The foundation was reinforced during the last year's visit to the Soviet Union by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India and as a result of the joint cooperation documents signed in Moscow".

Next year the USSR will continue to supply India with a number of commodities which are wanted by various branches of the republic's industry. These are, in particular, machines and equipment, oil and oil products, non-ferrous metals, synthetic rubber, newsprint, and fertilizers. Apart from traditional export commodities, India, for its part, will deliver engineering products, freight containers, shoe uppers, sewn and knitted goods, chemical products, and pharmaceuticals to the Soviet Union.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA VIEWS SERVICE IN PANJSHER VALLEY

PM121549 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 November 1986 First Edition carries on page 4 under the rubric "Writer's Notes" and the headline "Ravine" a full-page 5,500-word report by Colonel Yuriy Belichenko on his visit to the DRA's Panjsher Valley. Belichenko was initially attracted to the area by Soviet soldiers' songs, the verses of two of which read "I am not an invader here, I am not a foreigner, I have come to defend a neighboring country..." and "Russian soldiers sleep uneasily on Afghanistan's scorched earth..."

After a long excursion into the history of Afghanistan in general and the Panjsher Valley in particular, Belichenko describes his meeting with a Major Petrov, who volunteered for the posting in order to check the value of his academy diplomas. The test was "tough" -- there were "attacks on posts by gangs. There was mortar shelling and machinegun fire from the dominating distant heights." Belichenko had been struck by how young the soldiers in the Panjsher were, and Petrov found on arrival that discipline was his main problem because the young junior officers "thought that while there was shooting going on a commander should be a commander, but when the shooting stopped strict regulations could go by the board." Petrov and his deputy political officer Aleksandr Litvinenko set about "restructuring subordinates' awareness."

In conclusion, Belichenko ponders "why any of these people" are prepared to "die in combat tomorrow." His answer is that they are ensuring "not only the free and independent future of the Afghan people but the lasting security of our fatherland's southern borders." As a postscript Belichenko quotes from a letter from Litvinenko, received 2 months after his visit, stating that Major Luksha, deputy commander of the unit, had been killed.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON ALIYEV TALKS IN VIENTIANE

Meets Cambodia's Heng Samrin

LD151447 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] A meeting was held in Vientiane today between the heads of delegations of the CPSU and the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party [KPRP] taking part in the proceedings of the fourth congress of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] -- Comrade Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Heng Samrin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party, chairman of the Kampuchean Council of State. Also today, the CPSU delegation visited the "Lao-Soviet Friendship" polytechnic college in Vientiane. The members of the delegation viewed the lecture rooms and laboratories and chatted with students and teachers. A friendship meeting was held in the assembly hall, and it was addressed by Comrade Aliyev. The emissaries of Soviet communists then visited the museum of the revolution.

There was also a warm meeting between the CPSU delegation and the leaders and activists of the Lao-Soviet Friendship Society.

Aliyev, Kaysone Hold Talks

LD160752 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Vientiane November 16 TASS -- A friendly meeting was held here today between the CPSU delegation headed by Geydar Aliyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Council of Ministers of Laos.

Aliyev warmly congratulated Phomvihan on the successful completion of the 4th LPRP Congress which became an important step in the political life of the party, of the entire Laotian society.

Phomvihan described the broad response within the party and the nation to the results of the congress and the decisions it adopted. He asked that cordial gratitude be conveyed to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for his congratulations in connection with Phomvihan's election to the post of general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee.

The mutual determination was expressed to continue strengthening and developing all-round cooperation between the CPSU and the LPRP, between the USSR and Laos.

The meeting was attended by Sali Vongkhamsao, member of the Politburo and secretary of the LPRP Central Committee, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee of Laos.

SYRIA'S TALAS RECEIVES GENERAL IVANOVSKIY

PM141443 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Nov 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] Damascus, 12 Nov -- M. Talas, deputy commander in chief of the Syrian Arab Republic Armed Forces and Syrian deputy prime minister and defense minister, has met with Army General Ye. F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who has arrived here on an official visit. Corps General H. Al-Shihabi, chief of the Syrian Armed Forces General Staff, participated in the talks, which were held in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere.

PRAVDA COMMENTS ON UK-U.S. 'ANTI-SYRIAN CAMPAIGN'

PM141155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 86 First p 5

[Own correspondents A. Maslennikov and Yu. Glukhov reports followed by Vladimir Peresada "Observer's Opinion" under general heading: "Syria Will Not Be Intimidated"]

[Text] London, 11 Nov -- As has already been reported, a conference of Common Market countries' foreign ministers held here has decided to introduce sanctions against Syria because of its "complicity" in international terrorism.

And even though these accusations have not been proved, the British Government earlier announced the severance of diplomatic relations with the Syrian Arab Republic, demanding that its EEC partners and NATO allies do the same. Initially, a response to this call was forthcoming only from the United States, which recalled its ambassador from Damascus, and partly from Canada, whose government summoned the head of its diplomatic mission for consultations in Ottawa. As for Britain's other allies in the so-called "Western Alliance," they were evidently in no hurry to jeopardize their Near East interests to please the United States and Britain.

Nonetheless, London and Washington continued to build up the pressure and, as the results of the London conference showed, it was to some effect. The participants in the meeting agreed to ban military exports to Syria, to postpone previously planned exchanges of top-level visits with that country, to curb the activities of Syrian diplomatic missions, and also to step up surveillance of Syrian citizens traveling to West Europe for commercial and other business.

Commenting on the results of the meeting, Britain's THE GUARDIAN notes that only 11 of the 12 participants in the conference signed the communique, with the Great foreign minister refusing to join in the sanctions. The newspaper writes that the implementation of the planned sanctions will inevitably run up against considerable difficulties. "In any case," THE TIMES concludes, "one gets the impression that national economic and diplomatic interests took precedence over the need to take coordinated joint actions."

Damascus, 11 Nov -- The frenzied anti-Syrian campaign which has culminated in the rupture of Anglo-Syrian diplomatic relations and the instigation of European states to adopt "collective sanctions" against Damascus was calculated to intimidate the Syrians and generate panic and confusion. In actual fact it has produced the opposite results.

What is happening is a mobilization of not only the country's economic and human potential, but also its moral and psychological resources, its staunchness, endurance, and readiness to defend its chosen path.

An emergency session of the Central Council of the country's National Progressive Front -- the main political organization uniting Syria's leading parties, including the ruling Ba'th Party, the Communist Party, and a number of other parties -- was held. Speaking at the session, Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad exposed the West's attempts to implement neocolonialist plans by taking advantage of the propaganda ballyhoo around Syria. Imperialism, he declared, will never succeed in restoring its domination in the Arab East or in binding the Arab countries to itself. H. al-Asad noted the Syrian people's resolve to defend their gains regardless of any sacrifices. An appeal adopted by the National Progressive Front expresses loyalty to the country's principled and consistent policy of rebuffing imperialist conspiracies and attempts by the United States and Israel to impose a capitulationist settlement on the Arabs.

A wave of mass rallies by various public organizations and protest demonstrations against the crude interference in Syria's affairs has swept through the country, at enterprises and institutions and in education establishments and peasant cooperatives. The seventh conference of the General Union of Damascus Workers was held beneath the sign of enhanced vigilance and staunchness in resisting the global offensive which the forces of imperialism and Zionism are trying to launch against Syria.

Working Syria has responded to the challenge in a worker fashion. A day of voluntary labor was held throughout the country on 7 November. In the words of I. Nasir, chairman of the General Federation of Labor Unions, about 500,000 working people reported for work in factories, plants, and construction sites. On that day the working class proved in deed, rather than in words, its determination to support the country's progressive anti-imperialist course, I was told by Riyad Abdallah, one of the trade union leaders.

In conversation with your correspondent, A. Ahmar, assistant secretary general of the ruling Ba'th Party, sharply criticized Britain's decision to break diplomatic relations with Syria. The step by M. Thatcher's government, he noted, falls within the framework of the course pursued by the U.S. Administration in an attempt to dampen the international response generated by the Soviet peace initiatives. Such attempts to exacerbate local conflicts and establish neocolonialist domination are doomed to failure.

Observer's Opinion [subhead]

Thus the anti-Syrian campaign fanned by London and Washington has entered a new round. Following Britain's severance of diplomatic relations with Syria and the recall of the U.S. ambassador from Damascus, the Common Market countries' foreign ministers have adopted a plan of "collective sanctions" against Syria.

These sanctions, including "boycott" measures in the sphere of political, trade, and economic relations and air links, are based, like all the propaganda attacks on Damascus, on a single "argument" -- the claims by London and Washington that Syria supposedly encourages "international terrorism." And specifically on groundless accusations against Syrian officials of complicity in the failed attempt to blow up an Israeli aircraft at London's airport last April. And even more precisely, on "admissions" by the organizer of that action, who, incidentally, is not a citizen of Syria and has absolutely nothing to do with that country.

The Common Market countries' decision on sanctions against Syria was made under direct pressure from Britain, backed by the United States. It is no accident that the Washington administration immediately approved this step, REUTER emphasizes. At the same time, London's and Washington's West European partners refrained from taking the tougher measures which, according to reports, the head of Britain's foreign policy department had on a list in his briefcase. The machinery of traditional obedience to the "senior partner" failed to function completely, and there was some room left to display common sense. The point is that people in West European capitals understand well how dangerous it is to fall for a provocation instigated by the Israeli special services. This is a threat not only to economic ties between European countries and the Near East, but also to the very stability of that region, which is already sufficiently explosive. Does Europe need a new conflict on its doorstep -- this is the question!

As for the overwhelming majority of the world community -- dozens of states, including capitlist ones -- people there are convinced that the "anti-Syrian crusade" launched by the leading Western powers and Israel is an attempt to "punish" a sovereign Arab state for its independent course which obstructs the implementation of imperialist plans in the Near East. This is a dangerous undertaking fraught with serious consequences for its instigators.

NEW ENVOY APPOINTED TO REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA

LD082103 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1816 GMT 8 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 8 Nov (TASS) -- The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Vladimir Sobchenko as USSR ambassador to the Republic of Tunisia. The 56-year-old Sobchenko did party work when he was younger, and from 1980 to 1986 he was USSR Ambassador to Laos.

The Supreme Soviet Presidium released Vsevolod Kizichenko from the duties of USSR ambassador to Tunisia in connection with his transfer to other work.

ZVEREZ REPLACES AKOPOV AS ENVOY TO KUWAIT

LD171042 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Mosocw November 17 TASS -- The presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Ernest Zverev as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to the State of Kuwait.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet released Pogos Akopov of the duties of the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to the State of Kuwait in view of his being transferred to another job.

Ernest Zverev was born in 1927. He has been in the diplomatic service since 1951. He has been working as senior assistant of the first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR since 1968.

EMBASSY IN MAPUTO DENIES MACHEL BLACK BOX PACT

MB161416 Luanda Domestic Service in Portuguese 1200 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] The Soviet Embassy in Mozambique has categorically denied that its country has reached agreement with South Africa on decoding black boxes of the Mozambican presidential plane that crashed last month inside South African territory. An employee of the Soviet Embassy in Maputo told the Portuguese News Agency, ANOP, that statements by South African Minister of Foreign Affairs Pik Botha on an agreement reached with Mozambique and the Soviet Union on this issue were groundless. The racist minister said the day before yesterday in Paris [as heard] that one of the black boxes which contains the flight register of the Tupolev 134 plane would be given to Soviet investigators to be decoded in Moscow and that the other would remain in Pretoria.

The Soviet ambassador in Maputo added that the international commission of enquiry, which is investigating the causes of the accident that killed President Samora Machel, has not yet reached any agreement on the decoding of the black boxes due to the constant manuevers of the Pretoria racist regime.

This misleading statement by the South African minister was also denied in Moscow by Ivan Vasin, deputy Soviet minister of civil aviation. During a press conference Ivan Vasin denied that an agreement had been reached on where the decoding of the black boxes would take place. He also stated that a radio station operating inside South African territory could have drawn the plane off its flight route toward a rocky region.

AMBASSADOR TO MAURITANIA REPLACED BY KOMOGOROV

PM111333 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Nov 86 First Edition p 8

[Unattributed "News Item"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Leonid Mikhaylovich Komogorov USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Ivan Stepanovich Spitskiy from his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania in connection with his retirement on pension.

BRIEFS

DELEGATION VISITS TANZANIA — A visit to Tanzania by a delegation of the Soviet public headed by Vitautas Zenkyavichyus, a member of the presidium of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity With Asian and African Peoples, minister of foreign affairs of Lithuanian SSR, is over. The delegation also visited Angola and Zambia. Addressing a final press conference in Dar es Salaam; the head of the Soviet delegation noted that the main aim of the visit consisted of reaffirming to the peoples of the Frontline States the firm support by Soviet people for their struggle for independence against apartheid, colonialism, and neocolonialism. He stressed that in Angola as well as Zambia and Tanzania, the delegation had numerous meetings and conversations in the course of which numerous matters were discussed connected with the political and economic situation in Africa, and the development of the situation in the south of the continent. [Excerpts] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 1 Nov 86 LD]

SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM HOLDS SESSION

Ratifies Accident Convention

LD141719 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has today unanimously ratified the convention on prompt warning on nuclear accidents and the convention on assistance in the emergency of of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation situation, which were signed in Vienna on September 26, 1986.

A detailed reference of the conventions and of their significance for the development of cooperation among states in such a vitally important and promising field as peaceful uses of nuclear energy has been given at the meeting.

Summing up the results of the exchange of views, Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, laid special emphasis on the broad worldwide support for the proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to create an international regime of safe development of nuclear power engineering on the basis of close cooperation of all countries developing nuclear power engineering.

The fundamentals of such a regime were outlined at the special session of the IAEA General Conference in September this year. We are grateful to all the countries and international organisations for their efforts made on that issue. The preparation at IAEA of two international conventions over such a short time is a convincing example that states can jointly look for and find a solution to the complex problems, interwoven in which are quite often politics and economy, scientific-technical and humanitarian aspects. The Soviet Union will further do its utmost to implement the programme put forward by us for the total and worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons. The regime of safe development of nuclear power engineering also can and must become a weighty contribution to the cause of ensuring universal security.

Reservation on Convention

LD141759 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, November 14 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has issued today a decree on the ratification of the convention on prompt warning on nuclear accidents and the convention on assistance in the eventuality of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation situation, which were signed on behalf of the USSR in Vienna on September 26, 1986. The documents have been ratified with the following reservation:

The USSR will not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of Article 11 (Point 2) of the convention on prompt warning on a nuclear accident and Article 13 (Point 2) of the convention on assistance in the eventuality of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation, situation which provide for the possibility of submitting a dispute between the participating states to arbitration or international court at the request of any side, and declares that consent of all sides in each individual case is necessary for submitting any international dispute to arbitration or international court.

Leaders at Session

LD150437 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report on 14 November session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium]

[Text] A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium took place today in the Kremlin under the chairmanship of Comrade Gromyko. Matters were discussed in connection with the holding of the sixth session of the 11th convocation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium then considered the matter of the ratification of the convention on prompt warning on nuclear accidents and the convention on assistance in the event of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation situation, which were signed in Vienna on 26 September 1986. Comrade Shcherbina, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, delivered a report on behalf of the USSR Government which submitted these conventions for ratification.

In the report and speeches by participants in the session, a detailed reference was given of the conventions and of their significance for the development of cooperation between states in such a vitally important and promising field as the peaceful use of nuclear energy. It was stressed that the conventions submitted for ratification are in accord with the USSR Constitution and the foreign policy course conducted by the CPSU and the Soviet state, and that they meet the interests of the Soviet people.

Summing up the results of the exchange of views which took place, Comrade Gromyko stressed the widespread international support that had been given to the proposals put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to create an international regime for the safe development of nuclear power engineering on the basis of close cooperation between all countries. The Soviet Union will continue to do its utmost to implement the program put forward by us for the total and worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons. The regime of safe development of nuclear power engineering also can and should become a weighty contribution to the cause of ensuring universal security.

The USSR Supreme Soviet presidium unanimously ratified the aforementioned conventions. Taking part in the discussion of points on the agenda were: Comrades Kunayev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Yeltsin, Slyunkov, and Solovyev.

SUPREME SOVIET SESSION BEGINS; GORBACHEV ATTENDS

LD170713 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0705 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS) -- A regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet -- the Soviet parliament -- opened in the Kremlin today. Taking part in its work are Mikhail Gorbachev, Nikolay Ryzhkov, and other Soviet leaders.

Sokolov Present at Session

LD170842 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] The sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened 1 hour ago in the Great Palace of the Kremlin.

The deputies and guests assembled for the joint sessions of the chambers greeted with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Shcherbitskiy; Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Slyunkov, Sokolov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Medvedev, Nikonov, Razumovskiy and Kapitonov.

The participants of the session unanimously endorsed the agenda and procedure. They decided to table for discussion the following matters:
-The state plan for the economic and social development of the USSR in 1987, and the progress of fulfillment of the program for this year;
-The USSR state budget for next year, and implementation of the budget for 1985;
-The work of the USSR People's Control Committee;
-The USSR draft law on individual labour activity; and
-Endorsement of decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
-A report on the first question is now being delivered at the session by Deputy Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of USSR Gosplan.

Agenda Confirmed

LD170803 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened 1/2 an hour ago in the Great Kremlin Palace. The deputies and guests welcomed Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and other leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state with a stormy and prolonged applause.

The session confirmed its agenda to include the following questions: Next year's state plan for the country's social and economic development and the progress in the fulfillment of this year's program; the 1987 state budget and the execution of the 1985 budget; the activities of the People's Control Committee; the draft USSR law on individual labor activity; and the ratification of decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The deputies then started to examine the first question. A report on next year's state plan for the country's social and economic development and the progress of fulfillment of this year's program is now being delivered by deputy Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee.

Marchuk, Shalayev Speak

LD171238 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 17 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpts] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation has opened in the Great Kremlin Palace. [passage omitted] Video shows leaders entering, including Sokolov, who walks unaided, apparently without difficulty; the leaders are then shown seated as follows: on the right of the platform second row, left to right: Razumovskiy, Nikonov; third row, left to right: Shcherbitskiy, Kunayev, Medvedev, Kapitonov; fourth row, left to right: Dobrynin, Biryukova, Sokolov, Solovyev, Slyunkov, Shevardnadze can be seen seated next to Yeltsin in the fourth row. Also seen on the platform are First Deputy Premier Antonov; Deputy Premier Gusev, Voronin, Kamentsev; Maslyukov, and Sacherbina; Deputy Chairmen of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet Paton, Kulova, Grishkyavichus; Deputy Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet Lobacheva]

A report on the country's state budget for the next year and on the execution of the 1985 budget was delivered by Deputy Gostev, USSR minister of finance. [video shows Gostev speaking]

Speeches were then made by Deputy Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Deputy Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU [video shows Marchuk and Shalayev speaking]

With this the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet concluded.

Talyzin Delivers Report

LD170912 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- The highest growth of national income and industrial production in the eighties is being expected in the USSR this year -- thanks to measures on restructuring and accelerating social and economic development, Nikolay Talyzin, chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR (Gosplan), has pointed out.

He today delivered a report on the 1987 Draft Plan of the country's development at the session of the Supreme Soviet, currently under way in the Kremlin.

Noting that key development indicators were higher in 1986 than planned, Talyzin emphasized that transition to a new style in work was slow in some branches, and no qualitative breakthrough had as yet begun.

"1987 will become a year of the broad application of new methods of economic management. This is reflected in the plan: The national income is to grow by 4.1 per cent (the 1986 plan provided for a 3.9 per cent increase) and industrial output is to increase by 4.4 per cent (the 1986 plan -- 4.3 per cent).

Labour productivity will grow by four per cent. Measures have been defined for accelerating scientific and technological progress and ensuring faster growth of the output of machines."

The report pointed at the enhancement of the social direction of the plan -- three-quarters of the national income growth would be directed at raising living standards.

"1987 will see the growth of wages and salaries, higher payments and allowances, greater production of consumer goods and services and better food supply.

More houses will be built in 1987 than planned earlier. The increase will amount to about 250,000 flats compared with the average yearly level in 1981-1985."

Speaking about the USSR's foreign economic ties, Talyzin emphasized that socialist economic integration within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) would broaden and deepen next year.

The Soviet Union, the speaker said, would continue economic and technological assistance to the developing countries in strengthening key brances of their economies.

"Trade and economic relations with the developed capitalist countries will continue to be carried out."

Gostev Speaks on Budget

LD170952 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- It is planned to fix the 1987 state budget of the USSR at 435.5 billion roubles in the revenues and at 435.3 billion roubles in the expenditures parts.

These figures have been given by Soviet Finance Minister Boris Gostev who addressed the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin today with a report on the country's 1987 budget.

He observed that socialist economy proceeds constituted the decisive source of budget revenues.

The 1987 budget set aside 20.2 billion roubles for defence needs. The share of the allocations were preserved at the current year's level.

Gostev said that the USSR was invariably opposed to the senseless waste of immense labour, material and financial resources on the arms race.

First Joint Session Ends

LD171049 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Special correspondent Olga Vasilyeva report from the Grand Kremlin Palace]

[Excerpt] The first joint session of both chambers of the Supreme Soviet has just ended. The agenda was approved. I remind you that it includes issues of the country's plan and budget for next year, the work of the People's Control Committee and a bill on individual labor activity. The session will last for 3 days [as heard].

This morning the deputies heard reports on the plan and budget. The reports were presented by USSR Gosplan Chairman Talyzin and Finance Minister Gostev.

Well, what can I espcially emphasize in these reports? The results over 10 months of this year show that our economy is already now reaching the levels of the average annual tasks in the 5-year plan. But at the same time there has not yet been a noticeable quality breakthrough in many branches of the national economy. That is why next year will become a year of wide application of economy management methods. A number of union ministries and major associations and enterprises are going to work in conditions of financial autonomy. The basis of their work will be 100-percent fulfillment of contractual liabilities. This will become one of the most important assessment indices. But the leading place is, of course, taken by quality. [passage omitted]

Separate Debates Begin

LD171137 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS — The USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) opened a debate in the afternoon today on the drafts of the plan of the USSR socio-economic development and the budget for 1987. The debate runs separately in two chambers — the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities.

The reports on the drafts of those documents were made at today's morning meeting.

The session of the Soviet parliament opened today.

GORBACHEV SPEAKS ON STATE ACCEPTANCE OF PRODUCTS

PM171141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86

["Conference at the CPSU Central Committee; Speech by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev" — PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Comrades! The Central Committee Politburo considered it necessary to call the present conference at the CPSU Central Committee in order to discuss practical tasks linked with the implementation of the decision taken by the party and government of the introduction of state acceptance of output at enterprises of the industrial ministries.

We have invited secretaries of the Central Committee of the Communist Parties of the union republics, of kraykoms, obkoms and gorkoms, of the party, the leaders of central organs, ministries, associations, enterprises, specialists, scientists and people working for the technical control and state acceptance services.

Some of you might feel that you have been taken away from important business and that the agenda for the conference is not particularly important, or that it is routine, as we sometimes say. If any of you have come here with that kind of opinion I would ask you to get rid of it before the conference begins because that is a delusion.

In point of fact we are talking about an issue of enormous social and economic importance, because the result of the work of all branches of the economy is summed up in the quality of output. What we are talking about is the kind of output that is dispatched into the national economy, that determines its technical level, and that also determines the everyday living conditions of the individual and satisfies his needs, and hence the way people feel and their attitude toward all the processes that are taking place in the country.

The saturation of the market with articles of a high technical standard and with high quality consumer goods is the main sign of a full-blooded, flourishing economy. And, on the other hand, low quality and bad, careless work is the most dangerous form of squandering both social labor and material and technical resources and the whole of our national wealth overall. For generally speaking, comrades, the market in goods in our country is in many cases already being saturated and is approaching the optimum.

This work must be done dynamically in the future, so that production will not get into the state where people won't take what is being produced. There are already instances where many goods lie around not being bought. People must be offered new goods, with new consumer qualities, and then they will buy them, value them, and be appreciative.

If we look even now at the structure of our consumer goods in many ways we are even higher than the West and near to rational norms. At the same time we have a permanent shortage of many items. If these goods appear on the home market, but with the label "made in some West European country", they are snatched up. A crazy situation develops. Why? Because the majority of our goods are uncompetitive. At the same time, we know that there are instances where they stick a Western label on our good items and then they sell like hot cakes.

The way things go with the raising of quality is the way things will go throughout our economy. That in fact is how the question must be looked at.

If we produce all our output and goods with high quality then the question would be solved in many respects with regard to quantity too. It is absolutely essential to satisfy our economy and home market. Unless we make a powerful and profound spurt in this area of our economy we shall not be able to manage the fulfillment of our plans and the achievement of the aims we have set, and we shall disappoint the hopes that have arisen in our society and among our people.

In my trips and conversations I have sometimes heard the f[illegible]lowing argument: The Central Committee and the government are putting forward the t[illegible]k of acceleration, but surely acceleration can't be compatible with quality?

Comrades, acceleration must come only by means of high quality, [illegible]y means of the best production with great productive capabilities that ensure savin[illegible] of labor, resources, and technologies. Only by means of quality. Accelerations is in[illegible]ssolubly linked with quality. Anyone who thinks otherwise has still failed to unders[illegible]nd what acceleration is. He thinks it means somehow, come on, get it out. He dosen't[illegible] top to ask himself: Do the economy and the people actually need it in this form? Th[illegible] kind of approach is not acceleration, it's the Stone Age from a modern point of view.

Acceleration above all through technical progress, through going over to new equipment and technology and activation of the human factor. The main thing is quality and once again quality!

That, strictly, is the price of this problem which to some people might appear to be ordinary and run-of-the-mill. Reality itself has placed issues of quality on the agenda. It has placed them sharply, very sharply at the center of the restructuring.

And we have formulated this position with precision, clarity, and certainty. I shall put it thus, comrades: it is your hands -- all those who are present here and represent equally the industries, party organizations and labor collectives -- it is your hands that hold the practical levers with whose aid the success of the great cause should be ensured. Today's discussion should be conducted precisely with a full comprehension of all this.

We should not be trying to persuade each other here or engage in self-accounting but share ideas on what is being done, what is to be done, what has been neglected, and where attention should be focused.

Comrades, a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which will adopt the state plan for economic and social development of the USSR for the 2d year of the 5-year plan, will start work in 3 days. Many of the secretaries, Supreme Soviet deputies present here are already familiar with the indicators of that plan. As we have already determined long ago, the current 5-year plan occupies a special place in our 15-year program, a key place. It is here that the main reserves of work done in advance will be created. Whatever we create in advance in the economy and in the field of management, whatever we do in advance from the point of view of the dynamism of the political process in the country and social policy, whatever we do in advance from the point of view of mastering new methods of work by the party and our cadres, all this will subsequently impinge on the results of our future 15-year work.

The current 5-year plan period, therefore, is the most difficult, most complex, but the most interesting 5-year plan period. In building up the dynamism of our work we are under an obligation to ensure that the main economic tasks are solved in an organic unity. It is precisely thus that the plan for the 2d year has been compiled -- acceleration of the rate of development, the cardinal renewal of production and technology, and ensuring that industrial manufactures and consumer goods are produced without fail at an increasingly high technical level and standard of quality. These are the main component parts of the philosophy of the plan for the 2d year of the 5-year plan period.

We have already begun our work on raising quality. In connection with this I want to remind you of the letter from the Central Committee "on a radical raising of the quality of output" to all party committees, local soviet and economic organs, to party, trade union and Komsomol organizations, to all working people -- a fairly frank party document that did not gloss over anything.

We have already begun work on this letter. And it is beginning to bear fruit. The call by the Central Committee for a decisive turning point in ensuring high quality of output has been received with understanding.

I could cite dozens of enterprises now where they have set about doing this in a proper fashion and have achieved within a short time a situation in which output, which formerly used to be accepted neither by the national economy nor by the internal market -- and certainly not by export -- is today selling like hot cakes. In other words we can do it, comrades, we can do it.

Nevetheless, things are not going as they should. It's not on the scale that's needed. And you leaders, both at the center and locally, know: it would appear that some work has been done under pressure from the Central Committee, there's been some talking, they have discussed the letter of the Central Committee, something has been started, but this work has not yet had its real turning point.

I am of course nowhere near naively believing that tomorrow or the day after tomorrow the whole 100 percent of engineering output being made will be in accordance with world levels. After all, to achieve that a lot of things have to be changed, everything has to be rethought, we have to begin by determining the direction in which to seek quality of goods, comparing it with the world level, design and then distribute them among enterprises, restructure equipment and technology, bring in cadres -- and all this of course demands time and effort. [paragraph continues]

But when I say that this work is slow in getting off the ground, no one can quarrel with that. Of course, it is a very difficult business, covering equipment, and the organization of labor, materials, manufactured items for further assembly, the competence of the staff -- everything. That, so to say, is what should crown our production, the final product itself. That is why I want to say yet again: improvements have started, changes for the better are taking place in this matter, but not on the scale we need.

And another thing — I spoke about this at the 27th Congress, and remember how long we took to formulate this part.

How long are we going to go on with the situation in the national economy where not only those who make progressive, quality products live a decent life, but so do those who make any old thing. They live untroubled -- and what's worse, a person who produces garbage has an easier life, because the equipment is not being modernized, he doesn't need to strain himself, he doesn't need to overstrain his mental and nervous system. He gets his pay and his bonuses for useless or poor quality output.

If we were now to say to many people: You will put 100 percent of your output on the foreign market and whatever you earn is all yours, just get on with it. All 100 percent! But they'll be reduced to begging, because no one needs their low quality output. That's not the way, comrades.

In conditions of restructuring, questions of quality must be accorded a central place. It is essential to embark on more decisive measures in all aspects of work in raising quality. Here I attach a lot of importance to financial autonomy and its main principle: Whatever you earn, consume, use and divide according to final results.

And the end result is the output and the resources that have been earned with it. If the output is needed neither by the consumer nor by the national economy, then you will not get any earnings. And not having received any earnings you will have to think about how you are going to go on living in the future.

Of course, I do not want to say that that is how things have been today and that full financial autonomy is going to be introduced tomorrow. That does not happen. But it is, without doubt, correct that we must embark upon the solution of this task through financial autonomy. In some cases this task will be solved more quickly, in others more slowly. Everyone has his own rate of doing things, but it is imperative that we move along this path. And payment must be made for what has been created, according to its quality. And the earnings that are received are the well-being of the whole collective, the enterprise, and of each person with due consideration for his specific contribution which is recorded under conditions of financial autonomy. This has to be borne in mind.

The introduction of the state acceptance of output from 1 January 1987 is one of the cardinal steps and tough measures. If one takes into consideration the fact that as a rule this applies to our major associations which provide important output of the national economy, then we are facing a fairly serious task whose solution will be of enormous significance.

I will put it like this: We did not embark upon the introduction of state acceptance for no particular reason, this idea was not thought up just for its own sake. An experiment was carried out with this kind of work. I spoke about this at the June plenum of the Central Committee of the party. In particular I named the Moscow "Frezer" works. There the process of introducing state acceptance did not pass off painlessly. [paragraph continues]

At that enterprise it was discovered that their technology and documentation did not match the technology; the tooling, it turned out was not right, qualifications, so to speak needed raising and so on, and the incentives, and the output acceptance system, and the initial control, and the manufactures used in production: all at once, so to speak, a whole circle of problems took shape.

For several months they suffered. But later all indicators at Frezer improved. And people immediately saw for themselves that they could work properly and produce truly good products.

But here is a question: There are reports that state acceptance bodies, having barely come into the world, here and there have already sunk in the mire of bureaucracy and red tape. A tendency has appeared for paper-shuffling, new forms of accounting, not legalized by anybody anywhere, certificates and all sorts of memos. Now, this is disgraceful. If state acceptance is going to think of itself as some kind of special caste, which can only threaten and behave in a self-willed manner, it is no longer state acceptance. People who understand what's what should be selected right from the start, as the activities of acceptance bodies affect the fortunes of people, collectives and society as a whole.

People with a wide range of political and technical interests, who are literate and morally mature should be selected for state acceptance bodies.

This is where the role of the party committees must be seen. It is no secret that some leaders of enterprises argue more or less like this: Why should I give intelligent, skillful workers to the State Acceptance Service? They'll only go and twist my arm afterwards. This attitude means, Comrades, that this manager himself has not been restructured and has not realised the importance of what is happening.

Workers are needed whose hearts are in the common cause. When a representative of the State Acceptance Service sees that in this or that section that this or that item is being produced substandard, he'll go there himself, will call in the designer, the engineer, the technologist and organize the production process, and fight for quality along with the workers. That approach will arouse the right response among the people.

I think that in the remaining 1 and 1/2 months of the year we have to start special features on television and in the press about the preparation of enterprises and industries for the state acceptance process to recount extensively and interestingly the good frontranking experience in this business. Public opinion needs to be formed actively and aggressively, people must be prepared, and the idea behind what is happening must be explained.

I will put it like this: The fundamental issue in introducting state acceptance is the preparation for it. The way things go will depend on the way that the enterprises and the industry are prepared for the introduction of state acceptance. Given good preparation this process will proceed in substantial measure painlessly and without any particular shocks. On the other hand, serious complications are likely to arise in places where they consider that, well, there's nowhere for them to go, they'll still take the output all the same.

We cannot exploit socialism. Under socialism, they say, come what may they won't cast aside the labor collective in its misfortune, under socialism they will still find a solution. The local party organizations will begin telephoning the Central Committee getting them to pay irrespective of the manner in which they have worked.

And indeed there have already been such cases. For example, they brought in some particular line, they went over to new technology, they changed the norms, the loading, and the production changed. But they didn't work well with the people; they decided everything in their offices.

The approach to this has to be a statesmanlike one, not one that is formal and bureaucratic, so that social, economic and political distortions do not result. During the 1 and 1/2 months that remain it is essential that party committees do all that is necessary and concentrate on work with people. Think over everything and do everything that has to be done. The directions of the work are clear.

Everything has to be done with the participation of the people. An action of extremely great importance will not work if it is done high-handedly. And this measure -- the state acceptance of output -- is a very major one. Hence the demands now being made of the preparations are special ones, too. I am drawing your attention to all of this so that later if failures are discovered in some particular places we will be right in calling to account both ministers and leaders of enterprises and leaders of party organizations. And we will make them answer. I want to stress this aspect especially, the aspect of the organizational, political work, of the technical preparations for introducing such a major measure as state acceptance.

This has to be borne in mind: we have too much neglect here. A great deal has been let slip. For too long engineering and technical cadres and other workers in industry have become injured to mediocrity and have set their sights on lowered criteria. All this has to be put right, and put right resolutely. What is needed, therefore, is some great, serious, deep, and responsible work. There is no other way. We cannot reject this path; we have to go along this road. Intelligent, far-sighted, solid work is needed.

Issues concerning the strengthening of order and discipline continue to need party attention and support. Without order and discipline we will not solve anything. But there are people who say that they have put an end to drinking, that they have restructured, that they are now tired and exhausted. There are people who have thought that there has been enough talk about discipline, how long can one go on busying oneself with this.

This will not do. We still have not established order and discipline in a serious way. It will only be done in a serious way when every leader and especially every party committee understands properly the importance of these decisive factors in restructuring and in the functioning of our society in general, not just of the economy. There must not be any slackening of work in this sector. Discipline and order are the number one task. This has been the case and it remains so. We will therefore remind those who are going to be getting tired and those who become tired out that they have only themselves to blame.

We live at a time that is very tense and crucial for the destiny of our country and people. We must understand this clearly. Without resorting to big words I will say this: The period and the stage we are now going through is such that if we cope with the problems that face us, then this will have historic consequences for the country and its role in the world.

We hope that the conference will help us to draw lessons from both the positive experience, upon which light is evidently going to be shed here, and also from the negative side, for that, too, is experience. We must sort out thoroughly what has to be done in the changeover to state acceptance of output at the country's industrial enterprises from 1 January next year.

Zaykov Addresses Meeting

LD151508 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- A meeting was held at the CPSU Central Committee on November 14 to discuss questions pertaining to the introduction at the amalgamations and plants of the industrial ministries of the USSR of special non-departmental control bodies of state acceptance of products.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee made a speech at the meeting.

Lev Zaykov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed in his speech that the introduction of state acceptance is not an aim in itself. It shall not be viewed separately from the complex of measures being carried out to improve planning and management, place the amalgamations, plants and all industries to run along full cost-accounting principles, self-financing and profitableness, increasing the responsibility and independence of the plants, strengthening the stimulating role of the pay. These and many other measures have the aim of sharply improving the technical standards, reliability and quality of products, the quality of all of our work, Lev Zaykov said.

The introduction of state acceptance does not reduce only to the creation of an additional control section, he stressed, it takes a reorganization of the work done by all the participants in the production process -- workers, foremen, shop and plant managers.

Lev Zaykov pointed to the need for active and purposeful work to enhance the role of work collectives in increasing the organizational standards of labour, improving the quality of products.

DEMICHEV AT JOINT MEETING OF YOUTH COMMISSIONS

LD151430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] A joint meeting of the Youth Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Unions and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet took place today in the Kremlin. The activities of the soviets of people's deputies of Bryansk Oblast in improving work with young people was discussed. The deputies noted that much is being done in the oblast for the training of the new generation. The rich revolutionary battle and labor traditions are being skillfully used. Attention was also paid to the need to help young people to play a greater part in the solution of economic and social problems and to set up for them the necessary conditions of work, daily life and leisure.

Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took part in the commission's work.

EARLY NOVEMBER WEATHER, CROPS STATUS REPORTED

PM141421 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Nov 86 p 1

[Agrometeorologist N. Ignatova report under the rubric "The USSR Hydrometeorological Center Reports": "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] The dry and mild weather in most parts of the USSR's European territory lasted until the middle of the first 10-day period of November. Subsequently it became colder and rain fell in many areas. In a number of places a snow cover, 2-10 cm deep, formed. Conditions were favorable for the beginning of the wintering of winter grain crops. On most of the territory of the RSFSR Non-Chernozem Zone winter grain crops stopped growing 10-15 days later than normal.

In the south of Moldavia, the southern oblasts of the Ukraine, the south of Rostov Oblast, in Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays, and in the autonomous republics of North Caucasus where the warm weather in the main persisted, winter crops continued growing. The rain which fell toward the end of the 10-day period replenished the moisture reserves in the soil which favored plant growth and root formation.

In Transcaucasian republics the average air temperature was 1-3 degrees higher than normal. Maximum air temperatures remained between 17-21 degress. It rained frequently. Precipitation on most of the territory totaled between 25 and 55 mm, and between 65-140 mm in the western half of Georgia. Winter grain crops continued to grow thanks to the good moisture reserves in the soil.

Winter weather continued in the farming areas of Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan, but the average air temperature for the 10-day period was 2-5 degrees higher than normal. In West Siberia, northern Kazakhstan, Krasnoyarsk Kray, and Irkutsk Oblast temperatures fell to 10-15 degrees below zero on certain nights. Precipitation occurred in the shape of snow. North of the line linking Kustanay, Tselinograd, and Semipalatinsk the fields are covered by 1-10 cm of snow, and 11-18 cm in some places in Kemerovo and Novosibirsk Oblasts and Altay Kray. In West Siberia winter grain crops were in a state of winter dormancy and the wintering of sowings proceeded favorably.

Winter has made itself felt in East Siberia, especially in Yakutiya, where temperatures have fallen to minus 35-38 degrees. However, in daytime the frosts have been insignificant so far.

In Central Asian republics the weather was summery. Average air temperatures were 5-8 degrees higher than normal. During the day air temperature rose to 25 degrees, and 30 degrees in some places in the extreme south.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 11-14 NOV REPORTED

LD170138 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 11-14 November. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

11 November

According to the Tajik Central Statistical Administration, over 898,000 metric tons of cotton have been delivered in the Republic.

The farmers in the republic intend to produce at least another 12,000 metric tons. (0500)

Bashkiriya has fulfilled its plan on sales of sugar beets to the state: 1,315,000 metric tons have been delivered. (0700)

Surkhandarya Oblast has procured 500,000 metric tons of cotton since the start of the harvest; 87 percent consists of fine-fiber varieties. (0700)

12 November

The last metric tons of rice are reaching the procurement points in Krasnodar Kray with the plan being overfulfilled. A record crop of over 52 quintals per hectare has been achieved this year. (0300)

The kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the country have practically completed the lifting of sugar beets. According to the USSR state agro-industrial committee, over 70 million metric tons have been delivered to procurement points and sugar refineries. In contrast with previous years, the lifting took place in an organized manner. The farms of Belgorod, Kursk, and Orel Oblast were among the first in the RSFSR to fulfill their plans in the sale of sugar beets; in the Ukraine, Volhynia, Lvov, and Rovno Oblast were among the first. The sugar-growers of Lithuania and Belorussia quickly completed their harvest and fulfillment of the state plan. All the sugar refineries are now working at full capacity, on some days producing up to 2.5 million metric tons of sugar. Almost everywhere, more sugar is being obtained than in previous years from less raw material. (1900)

13 November

In Kazakhstan, the harvesting of spring crops has been completed. On 30 million hectares, grain, corn, groat crops have been reaped and threshed; sugar beet, potatoes and other vegetables have also been lifted. Despite difficult weather conditions, Kazakhstan has exceeded the annual plan for sales of grain to the state, and it has also produced a good crop of rice, corn and many industrial crops. (0700)

Tajik land cultivators have commenced above-plan sales of fine-fiber cotton. According to Statistical Administration data, 300,000 metric tons of raw cotton of particularly valuable strains have been delivered to the procurement points since the start of the harvest. Farms of Kurgan-Tyube Oblast, the main zone of cultivation of fine-fiber cotton, yielded more than 90 percent of the harvest. Our correspondent notes that the annual plan for gathering the raw cotton here was fulfilled for the first time in 5 years. Moreover, this high yield has been attained under difficult weather conditions. (1400)

Autumn plowing has been carried out on 350,000 hectares in Kirghiziya; less than 100,000 hectares remain to be ploughed. (0900)

14 November

Cotton harvesting is now complete in Tajikistan. Ploughing is now in progress, as well as general preparation of the land for spring sowing. Over 300,000 hectares of cotton fields have to be prepared in the republic as a whole. Today sees the end of fodder gathering in Kazakhstan. Meadow and sown grasses have been cut from over 32 million hectares throughout the republic. (1200)

Tajik cotton-growers have sold to the state 300,000 metric tons of valuable fine-fiber cotton. To date, a total of over 906,000 metric tons of cotton have been delivered to procurement points. (1430)

TASS NOTES COSMOS, MOLNIYA SATELLITE LAUNCHES

Cosmos-1791 Nov 13

LD131448 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1428 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS) -- Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1791, was launched in the Soviet Union today.

The satellite carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution, 105 mins; apogee, 1026 km; perigee, 972 km; orbital inclination, 83 deg.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to Earth data about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

Cosmos-1792 Nov 13

LD141223 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 (TASS) -- An artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1792, was launched in the Soviet Union on November 13.

The satellite carries scientific equipment for further exploring outer space.

The satellite was put into orbit with the following parametres:
initial period of revolution -- 89.6 minutes,
maximum distance from earth -- 357 kilometres,
minimum distance from earth -- 181 kilometres,
orbit inclination -- 64.9 degrees.
The equipment on board the satellite is functioning normally.

Molniya-1 Nov 16

LD170735 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0712 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS) -- Another communications satellite, "Molniya-1," was launched in the Soviet Union on 16 November 1986. The communications satellite "Molniya-1" is designed for long-distance telephone and telegraphic radio communications, and also the broadcasting of USSR central television programs to points in the "Orbita" network.

The satellite has been placed in a high elliptical orbit with an apogee of 40,817 km in the northern hemisphere, and a perigee of 469 km in the southern hemisphere. The satellite's period of rotation is 12 hours 16 minutes, and its inclination of orbit is 62.5 degrees.

Communications sessions via the "Molniya-1" satellite will be carried out in accordance with the set program.

LEADERS RECEIVE FURTHER GOSR GREETINGS

SRV Sends Greetings

PM141435 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Message of greetings from Truong Chinh, general secretary of the Communist Party of the Vietnam Central Committee and chairman of the SRV State Council; Pham Van Dong, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; and Nguyen Huu Tho, chairman of the SRV National Assembly, to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers on the occasion of the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- date not given]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee
USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

On the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- glorious festival of the Soviet people and working people of the whole world -- we send the most cordial congratulations to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers, and the entire fraternal Soviet people.

The history of social development has known no event to compare with Great October in terms of the power of its impact on the destiny of mankind. The victory of the October Revolution and the birth of the world's first worker-peasant state ushered in a new era in the history of mankind -- the era of the collapse of the imperialism and victory of socialism and communism worldwide.

In the past 69 years, following the course of Great October, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the glorious CPSU, have traveled a path filled with difficulties and hardship and, at the same time, remarkable victories and have ensured the reliable defense of their homeland, which has created favorable conditions for the triumph of socialist revolution in a whole series of European and Asian countries and in many other parts of the world and for the emergence of the world socialist system, which became a decisive factor in the development of human society.

The Vietnamese people are sincerely glad about Soviet people's immense achievements in comprehensively improving socialist society and communist building in the spirit of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

In the current tense international situation, which has taken shape through the fault of the United States and other bellicose imperialist forces, the Soviet Union conducts a consistent, peace-loving course and invariably displays good will and high responsibility for the destiny of peace and the peoples' security.

The Vietnamese people highly value and fully support the Soviet Union's initiatives set out in the recent exceedingly important speeches by CPSU Central Committee General M.S. Gorbachev concerning the halting of nuclear explosions and the nonmilitarization of space, as well as the USSR's specific proposals aimed at the stage-by-stage elimination of the threat of nuclear war and the creation of an all-embracing system of international security in order to reliably safeguard peace and ensure equal and mutually advantageous cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region and all over the world, which is the common task of the socialist countries and revolutionary and peace-loving forces.

Our people are deeply aware that without Great October and without the Soviet Union's decisive victory in World War II there would have been no August revolution and no new, Socialist Vietnam. Every victory achieved by the Vietnamese revolution in building and defending the motherland is bound up with the Soviet Union's great and effective assistance.

We note with deep satisfaction the steady development and strengthening of the fraternal friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the parties and peoples of our countries, which are founded on the immortal principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and on the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between Vietnam and the Soviet Union. The recent meetings between the top party and state leaders of Vietnam and the Soviet Union demonstrated the complete unity of views and the common resolve of our parties and countries to continue comprehensively strengthening the ties of friendship and cooperation and effectively coordinating collaboration between the SRV and the USSR in the international arena in the interests of the two countries' peoples and in the name of peace and socialism.

On behalf of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the SRV Government, and the Vietnamese people we express sincere gratitude to the CPSU, USSR Government, and fraternal Soviet people for the enormous, valuable, and effective assistance and support for the Vietnamese revolution.

We wish the Soviet people under the glorious CPSU's leadership new, even bigger victories in fulfilling the grand tasks determined by the 27th CPSU Congress to implement the program for the country's socioeconomic development through the year 2000 and in the struggle for peace and international security.

May the great friendship, militant solidarity, and comprehensive cooperation between the two countries' parties and peoples steadily strengthen and develop!

Truong Chinh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and chairman of the SRV State Council
Pham Van Dong, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers
Nguyen Huu Tho, chairman of the SRV National Assembly

DPRK Greets Ryzhkov

PM141142 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 86 Second Edition p 4

[Message of greetings from Kang Song-san, premier of the DPRK Administration Council, to N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- date not given]

[Text] To Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

On the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution I send you warmest congratulations and comradely greetings.

As a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution the Soviet people, under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik party, created the world's first worker-peasant state and built a socialist power with durable economic might and defense capability, and are today carrying out major revolutionary transformations and achieving labor successes in all spheres of public life in accordance with the party's strategic course of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, the course outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress.

We rejoice sincerely, as if they were our own successes, in the successes achieved by the fraternal Soviet people in implementing the great cause of socialism and communism, and we express full support and firm solidarity with the Soviet people's struggle to cut short and thwart the reckless intrigues of the imperialists in building up nuclear arms and to ensure lasting peace and security on our planet.

Allow me to take this opportunity to express confidence that the friendly Korean-Soviet relations, which were strengthened still more in the course of the recent meetings and talks between our two countries' leaders, will continue to expand and develop into relations of true friendship and cooperation between class brothers, the indissoluble allied relations of comrades in the revolution, and to wholeheartedly wish you and the Soviet people further great successes in the struggle to achieve scientific and technical progress, ensure the intensive, rapid development of the Soviet economy, boost the people's well-being on the basis of Soviet society's tremendous potential, and improve socialism in every way.

Kang Song-san,
Premier of the DPRK Administration Council.

Lao Leaders Send Message

PM141140 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 86 Second Edition p 4

[Message from Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and chairman of the Lao Council of Ministers, and Phoumi Vongvichit, acting president of Laos, to M.S. Gorbachev, A.A. Gromyko, and N.I. Ryzhkov on the October Revolution anniversary — date not given]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee;
Comrade A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Dear Comrades!
On behalf of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Central Committee, the Supreme People's Council and Council of Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR], and all of the Lao people and on our own account we send to you and, through you, to the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the USSR, and all the fraternal Soviet people warm greetings and sincere good wishes on the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution under V.I. Lenin's brilliant leadership, a victory that led to the creation of a socialist state, the world's first state of workers and peasants, is a great event and has profound international significance. It opened a new era -- the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism throughout the world.

The Soviet people, raising the victorious flag of the revolution and displaying great heroism, resolutely overcame all kinds of difficulties, successfully broke the ring of the blockade and rebuffed the intervention by imperialist states and the forces of counterrevolution, and reliably defended the gains of the socialist revolution. In the period of the Great Patriotic War the fraternal Soviet people achieved the feat of crushing Hitlerite fascism, thereby creating the conditions for the emergence of the world socialist system; they delivered mankind from slavery and fascist domination and brought freedom and happiness to the peoples of the world.

On the basis of labor traditions and creative initiatives, the courageous Soviet people achieved great successes in building the motherland, turned the Soviet Union into a great and mighty socialist power, created a durable economic and defense potential, and made the Land of the Soviets the reliable bulwark of the peoples fighting for peace, freedom, national independence, and social progress.

We admire the outstanding victories of the communists and the fraternal Soviet people, achieved in the course of fulfilling the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 12th 5-Year Plan for the socioeconomic development of the USSR.

The Lao people have always valued highly the Soviet Union's peace-loving, principled, and consistent foreign policy, aimed at ending the arms race, creating an all-embracing system of international security, averting the threat of nuclear war, and ensuring lasting peace throughout the world.

The party and state and all the multinational Lao people are proud of the continuous fruitful development of relations between the parties, states, and peoples of Laos and the Soviet Union on the basis of the immutable principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

May we take the opportunity, on this ceremonial occasion, to express profound gratitude to the party, the state, and the fraternal Soviet people for their support and invaluable all-around assistance to the cause of the Lao revolution and now in the defense and building of our socialist motherland.

We wish you, the communists, and the fraternal Soviet people great new successes in the cause of the all-around improvement of socialism, in the struggle for peace, and in the triumph of the great Lenin's cause.

Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee and chairman of the LPDR Council of Ministers;
Phoumi Vongvichit, acting president of the LPDR.

Ortega Greets Gorbachev

PM161443 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Message of greetings from Daniel Ortega, president of Nicaragua, to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- date not given]

[Text] To Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Dear Comrade!

Allow me on behalf of the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN] and the government and people of Nicaragua to congratulate the CPSU, the government, the Soviet people, and you personally on the 69th anniversary of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which falls on 7 November 1986.

The imperialist blockade and attacks on the Soviet Union with the aim of destroying the gains of the young October Socialist Revolution were futile, and the fascist onslaught in 1941 also failed to produce any particular results since, despite the 20 million killed and the enormous destruction, your country managed to rise from the ashes and become, together with the other socialist community countries, the bulwark of peace, solidarity, friendship among peoples, and internationalist cooperation.

We have followed with interest the numerous Soviet initiatives put forward in recent months with the aim of halting the escalating arms race, delivering the world from the nuclear threat, and forestalling its extension into space. There is no need to stress that Nicaragua, whose people know all about war, supports these initiatives which have been recklessly rejected by the Reagan administration.

During all the difficult years of trials our people have always known who are their enemies and who are their friends. Since the victory of its revolution, Nicaragua has enjoyed the Soviet Union's disinterested and benevolent support in the most varied spheres of the country's life, and we are confident of the Soviet Union's further militant and firm fraternal solidarity, the solidarity of its working people, men, women, and children.

For this reason, as we have said many times and will say everytime we are asked, for the Nicaraguans friendship with the Soviet Union is not a bargaining chip.

In the prevaling complex international situation, in conditions of disrespect for the most elementary norms of international law, especially now when the U.S. Administration is trying to lay down for governments and small countries who should and who may or may not be their friends, it is important to emphasize this principled stand based on national dignity.

Comrade Gorbachev! Allow me to assure you, the members of the CPSU Central Committee, all Soviet Communists, and the entire Soviet people of our profound gratitude and appreciation for the numerous manifestations of internationalism on your part toward our people. Please accept also our congratulations on the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

With fraternal greetings,
Daniel Ortega Saavedra, coordinator of the FSLN National Leadership Executive Committee and president of Nicaragua.

Hasani Greets Gromyko

PM141138 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 86 Second Edition p 4

[Text] To Comrade Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

On the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, on behalf of the peoples and ethnic groups of Yugoslavia and on my own account, I send to you, esteemed Comrade Gromyko, to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and to the friendly Soviet people cordial congratulations and best wishes for prosperity and new successes in socialist building.

I wish to take this opportunity once again to express satisfaction with the successful development of friendly relations and all-around, mutually advantageous cooperation between our countries on the jointly adopted principles. We see them as a firm foundation and broad framework for such development in the future too. We are convinced that this meets the true interests of the peoples of our two socialist countries and promotes the cause of peace, equal international cooperation, and universal progress throughout the world.

Sinan Hasani,
President of the SFRY Presidency.

FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 222 18 November 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Further on Shevardnadze Press Conference AA 1
Hits Remarks by FRG's Kohl AA 1
Relations With Israel AA 1
Chemical Weapons Ban AA 1
Gerasimov Briefs Press on Geneva Talks 14 Nov AA 2
Condemns Seizure of Assets [AFP] AA 3
Bogachev on 'Sorry Results' of Geneva Talks AA 3
U.S. Carries Out Nuclear Test Blast in Nevada AA 4
Shabayev Criticism AA 5
Kolesnichenko Comments AA 6

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation -- Questions and Answers' [Pravdin, Losev] CC 1

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Further Comments on U.S. Arms Sales to Iran A 1
Biryukov Criticizes NSC A 1
Tsvetov: Move Shows 'Cunning' A 2
Korionov Hits U.S. 'Deception' [PRAVDA 15 Nov] A 3
Arab Envoys 'Outraged' [Fedyashin] A 4
'Top Priority' Discusses U.S. Elections [Pozner, Bogdanov, Plekhanov] A 4
Seismologists Arrive for Experiment in U.S. A 9

NORTHEAST ASIA

MPR's Batmonh, Delegation Leave for DPRK C 1
Seen Off by Sodnom, Others C 1
Vladivostok Stopover [IZVESTIYA 18 Nov] C 1
Arrive, Greeted by Kim Il-song C 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Gorbachev Congratulates Laos' Kaysone Phomvihan [PRAVDA 16 Nov] E 1
Aliyev Returns From Visit to Lao Congress E 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Ligachev Visit to Helsinki G 1
Meets With President Koivisto G 1
Talks With Finnish CP Figures G 2
Meets With Center Party Leaders [PRAVDA 16 Nov] G 3

Visit to Industrial Center [PRAVDA 16 Nov] G 3
Communique on Ligachev Visit [PRAVDA 16 Nov] G 3
Delegation Departs Finland G 7
Returns From Helsinki G 7
TASS Criticizes UPI Report G 7
Moscow on Nuclear-Free Zone G 8
Gorbachev Book Ceremony Held G 9
Reportage on Visit of German Greens Delegation G 10
Received by Shevardnadze [PRAVDA 14 Nov] G 10
Talks With Gromyko [IZVESTIYA 14 Nov] G 10
DPA Version of Talks G 12
Dobrynin Receives Delegation G 12
Greens Hold Press Conference G 13
DPA Version of Conference G 13
Joint FRG Economic Commission Ends Work in Moscow [DPA] G 14
Report on Thatcher Press Conference, Reagan Talks G 15
Briefs: USSR Ambassador to Ireland G 15

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Government Statement on Nicaragua Policy [IZVESTIYA 17 Nov] K 1
U.S. Policy Cited 'Main Defendant' in Trial [Aleksandrov] K 2
CPSU CC Message to Argentine CP Congress [PRAVDA 6 Nov] K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session R 1
TASS Report R 1
Marchuk Address R 1
Foreign Affairs Commissions Meet R 2
Postsummit Message Proposed R 2
Evening Session R 3
Second Day's Work R 3
Deputies Debate Budget R 3
TV Reports Proceedings R 4
Power Ministry Criticized R 5
Soviet of Nationalities Session R 5
Voss Chairs Opening R 6
Socioeconomic Debate Continues R 6
IZVESTIYA on Supreme Soviet Presidium Session [16 Nov] R 6
Nuclear Convention Decree R 8
CPSU's Yeltsin Interviewed on Restructuring [Prague RUDE PRAVO 1 Nov] R 9
PRAVDA Reports Chernobyl Reactor Work Completed [15 Nov] R 15
Comparison of Production Conference Attendees [PRAVDA 16 Nov] R 18
TV Cooperates With Foreign Organizations R 18

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Leaders Sign Obituary of Farming Specialist T 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Nov]
CSA Cites Stockbreeding, Milk Production Data T 1
CSA Notes Cotton Harvesting Statistics T 1
Uzbek Harvest Behind Schedule T 1
Tajikistan Cotton Statistics T 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Leaders Continue To Send GOSR Congratulations V 1
Syria's Asad Sends Greetings [PRAVDA 11 Nov] V 1
Bulgarian Leaders' Greetings [PRAVDA 7 Nov] V 1
PRC Leaders' Greetings [PRAVDA 7 Nov] V 3
Sokolov, Others Sign War Veteran's Obituary V 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Oct]

FURTHER ON SHEVARDNADZE PRESS CONFERENCE

Hits Remarks by FRG's Kohl

LD101830 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1814 GMT 10 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 10 Nov (TASS) -- Answering a question about relations between the USSR and the FRG, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze stated today at a press conference: Fair relations have formed between us and the FRG in the sphere of economic cooperation and political contacts, including at a fairly high level. But recently certain remarks of an insulting nature were made by the federal chancellor with regard to the Soviet leadership, which have angered us to the depths of our souls. These remarks have been condemned also by public opinion in the FRG itself. As far as the people of the FRG, business circles and corresponding parties and organizations are concerned, we are in favor of normal mutually advantageous relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, the minister stressed.

Relations With Israel

LD101833 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 10 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 10 TASS -- There have been no change in the Soviet Union's relations with Israel, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told a news conference here today in reply to questions from attending newsmen.

"Our approach, our position of principle towards that country," he said, "remain unchanged. When Israel liberates all seized Arab territories, then it will be possible to talk about restoring diplomatic relations and developing bilateral ties."

Eduard Shevardnadze described Israel's joining the U.S. "Star Wars" program as a development which is more than alarming.

Asked about a visit by Washington's emissary Robert McFarlane to Iran, he said the U.S. Administration should explain McFarlane's mission. "When this kind of activity is conducted almost clandestinely, this is suspicious," he said.

Chemical Weapons Ban

LD101807 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 10 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 10 TASS -- "The year 1987 may become a decisive one for the conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons", Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, stated at a press conference today in answer to a question asked by a TASS correspondent.

"We can really expect to reach accord on this issue. But very much depends on what the U.S. stand will be".

"As far as inspection at request is concerned, the Soviet Union is ready to adopt as the basis for that the proposal introduced by Britain at the Geneva conference".

GERASIMOV BRIEFS PRESS ON GENEVA TALKS 14 NOV

LD141816 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1716 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] In Moscow today a briefing was given for Soviet and foreign journalists on current questions of international policy, by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry. He said, among other things: [Begin Gerasimov recording] A few words about the outcome of the sixth round of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear space weapons: We had Reykjavik fresh on our minds; after Reykjavik there was Vienna; after Vienna there was Geneva. The United States is transforming the construction of a nuclear-free world into the construction of a Tower of Babel. The tower never materialized because sides are speaking not only different languages, but about different things. After the Reykjavik summit the sides reached different conclusions as to what had been said and decided there. The sides differed also as to what had been discussed at Vienna, at the meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state.

Now problems have arisen about reaching conclusions on what happened at the Geneva round. U.S. officials are accusing the Soviet diplomats of not acting as they should have to build on the process achieved in Reykjavik. It is quite the other way round: It is the United States that did not act as it should have done to build on Reykjavik. The Americans are now just asking us to go downhill instead of ascending toward the heights. It is the United States that went back on its word and gave up the President's agreement to nuclear disarmament in 10 years. It is the U.S. diplomats who returned again to the figures and formulas that had apparently been overcome at Reykjavik by a bold decision to implement the rapid liquidation of nuclear weapons, bypassing the quagmire of arithmetic of levels and sublevels and other technical details, which are often used to drag out the whole problem of nuclear disarmament.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the proposals we made at the Geneva talks -- this was on 7 November -- are in complete accord with the results of Reykjavik, the Soviet position, and the concerted mutually-acceptable agreements and decisions achieved in the Icelandic capital. The package of measures proposed by the Soviet delegation -- which represents a balance of interests of the two sides, a balance of compromise -- gave grounds for expecting reciprocal constructive steps from the United States. No such steps followed, unfortunately. The U.S. side at the talks did everything it could to cancel out the results of Reykjavik.

As far as the U.S. position -- their actual position -- is concerned: the nuclear blasts in Nevada are a sufficiently loud indication of it, and the roar of the turbines of the 131st U.S. strategic bomber force, to be fitted with cruise missiles, is also an indication of it. The fitting of these bombers with cruise missiles signifies the United States' withdrawal outside the limits set by the SALT II treaty on the limitation of strategic armaments. The United States decided on its own to cross the Rubicon of limitations, and the decision about the 131st bomber throws down a bellicose challenge to the world. Strictly speaking, the bombers are not what counts here. The increase in the U.S. strike bomber fleet will be under one percent. Of course, specialists point out that the bomber will not yield any significant strategic gain. From the military point of view, additional worries are involved, and, economically, there are additional costs. But the political price is great. This bomber shows louder than any words where America wants to go. [end recording]

Condemns Seizure of Assets

AU141708 Paris AFP in English 1604 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, Nov 14 (AFP) -- The seizure of IZVESTIYA Washington correspondent Leonid Koriavin's typewriter by a lawyer for a man who won a libel case against the Soviet Government newspaper was a "gross" and "scandalous" act, a Soviet official said here Friday.

The U.S. authorities had "confiscated the tools of his trade" and did not "allow him a chance to contact his embassy", contrary to consular agreement between the two countries, foreign ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a press conference here.

A Los Angeles court had granted 413,000 dollars in damages to Raphael Gregorian, whom IZVESTIYA, in a 1984 article, accused of espionage.

He was subsequently expelled from the Soviet Union, where he had lived for 15 years selling medical equipment.

His lawyer, Gerald Kroll, who said the expulsion ruined Mr. Gregorian's career, on Thursday began seizing Soviet assets in the United States.

The first asset seized was the IZVESTIYA correspondent's Russian-print typewriter worth an estimated 500 dollars.

Mr. Kroll said he was ready to seize Soviet assets in Bank of America and Chase Manhattan Bank accounts, as well as more equipment in Mr. Koriavin's flat.

"We inventoried everything in the apartment that belongs to IZVESTIYA," he said. "There is a nice color TV and some office equipment worth a few thousand dollars. We will come back with a truck tomorrow and pick it up."

BOGACHEV ON 'SORRY RESULTS' OF GENEVA TALKS

LD141658 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev: Following the sixth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons, U.S. Administration officials have made a number of statements touting the progress made in Geneva which, according to them, was made possible by the understandings reached at the latest soviet-American summit in Reykjavik.

The head of the U.S. delegation to Geneva, Max Kampelman, characterized the latest round of the talks as the most fruitful of all the rounds held so far. President Reagan himself argued that the latest American proposals in Geneva reflected the understandings reached in Reykjavik.

However, it is clear from statements by the selfsame Washington officials that by "progress" at the sixth round of the Geneva talks they mean not the further approximation of the positions of the sides but the attempts of the American delegation unilaterally to revise the understandings reached in Reykjavik.

What Washington keeps praising is not the mutually acceptable solutions to a number of important problems reached in Reykjavik but the American proposals at the Geneva talks which actually cancel everything positive the sides achieved in Iceland.

The U.S. Administration still wants another channel for a race in space strike weapons to be opened. The United States refused in Geneva even to consider any proposals restricting the "Star Wars" program in one way or another. We want to increase the number of SDI tests and to advance the program, Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said in Washington.

Contrary to the statement of President Reagan in Reykjavik on U.S. readiness to abolish all strategic weapons over 10 years, the American side is now discussing at the Geneva talks only the removal of ballistic missiles, obviously hoping to preserve its four-fold superiority in strategic bombers, including those which carry cruise missiles.

The sides reached in Reykjavik the understanding that progress in every field of disarmament should be made as a package. The United States only refused to include in the "package of accords" its "Star Wars." President Reagan believed that the other items of the package had been agreed upon. Yet the American delegation to the Geneva talks groundlessly insisted that the question of medium-range nuclear missiles, on which the Soviet Union had made a concession to the U.S., should be tackled independently of the solution of the problem of strategic weapons as well. It was another substantial departure from the Reykjavik understandings.

They in the USA are arguing now over what President Reagan said in Reykjavik and what he meant to say but did not because of absentmindedness and coming up with stories about reservations, misunderstandings, etc. However, the sorry results of the sixth round of the talks on nuclear and space weapons show that the worst snag here is not "reservations."

It appears that, having come against the fierce resistance of the U.S. military-industrial complex, opposed to any accords with the USSR, the Washington administration has chosen to revise all the aspects of the understanding reached in Iceland and to retreat to the positions which the American side had held before the Reykjavik summit.

U.S. CARRIES OUT NUCLEAR TEST BLAST IN NEVADA

LD141649 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 14 TASS -- A new nuclear explosion has been conducted in the Nevada test-range in the USA today. Judging by the fact that the inhabitants of the city of Las Vegas lying at a comparatively large distance from the test-range were advised to seal up their windows, the exploded nuclear device was of a great yield.

In carrying on the programme for the nuclear weapons tests, the United States has again demonstrated its stubborn reluctance to heed the voice of reason and join in the moratorium on all nuclear blasts, which was unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union on August 5, 1985, and is observed by the USSR to this day.

Shabayev Criticism

LD141852 Moscow TASS in English 1822 GMT 14 Nov 86

["Unsupportable Stand" -- TASS identifier]

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

Seismographs recorded another American nuclear weapon test in Nevada, the 23rd in the 15 months since the Soviet Union had introduced its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

Seismographs are impartial instruments which only record earth tremors. People are different: They will never look on impassively as irresponsible politicians subvert the foundations of world peace and security. The opinion of hundreds upon hundreds of millions of these people was reflected in a resolution of the first committee of the U.N. General Assembly on the immediate termination and prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

The committee called upon all states to make every effort and to display political will immediately to draw up and conclude a comprehensive treaty to ban nuclear weapon tests and urged the United States to join the repeatedly extended Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions without waiting for the conclusion of the treaty. The delegations of 90 states voted for that draft resolution tabled by socialist countries and only three delegations, the USA, Britain and France, were against it.

Washington argues that the termination of nuclear tests calls for efficient control and at the same time is putting spokes into the wheels of the joint Soviet-American experiment called upon to demonstrate the dependability of a system of verification devised by scientists from the two countries. While American detection instruments were mounted near a Soviet nuclear test site way back in July and American scientists worked there, Soviet specialists were at first kept out of the USA and then granted visas but forbidden to travel to the areas where Soviet instruments were going to be mounted. So it is not verification that is Washington's headache but a pretext to continue nuclear tests.

They on the other side of the ocean keep harping on a U.S. "lag" in nuclear weapons, which should be closed through carrying on nuclear tests. But what "lag" are they talking about if the USA has carried out more nuclear weapon tests than all the nuclear powers put together, including the USSR? No, it is not to "catch up" with the Soviet Union that Washington is trying but to achieve military superiority and to secure U.S. dominance through strength in the world.

This position is absolutely unsupportable because it is at odds with the realities of our age and with the vital interests of the whole of mankind.

Kolesnichenko Comments

LD150328 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; commentary by Kolesnichenko, member of PRAVDA editorial board]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Among the most urgent problems of international politics, is one that I would call primordial and paramount: it is stopping all nuclear tests. For it is with nuclear tests, the nuclear blasts, that begins that chain which in the end leads to an increase in the arms race. Breaking this chain at its very beginning means halting the arms race, and it may even be possible to turn it back.

This is precisely the significance of the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear tests. Almost 3 months have gone by since we extended it for the fourth time up to January 1987. This bold, and let us say it openly, difficult step by the Soviet Union has evoked wide approval throughout the world, including from many statesmen. Well, let us recall the Delhi Six and their appeal for support for the Soviet moratorium. What is particularly important is that our unilateral moratorium is not just another appeal for peace but a specific action: new thinking embodied in a practical step. This is also how it has been perceived throughout the world.

But a moratorium cannot be endlessly unilateral; one cannot go for unilateral disarmament to the detriment of one's security, and so the Soviet leadership has more than once expressed the hope that the U.S. side would make a correct assessment of the silence on Soviet nuclear test ranges and follow the Soviet Union's example and adopt the stance of reason. These hopes, throughout the world, were bound in particular with the Reykjavik meeting where, among the main proposals put forward by the Soviet side, there was also the proposal on banning nuclear tests, and where, as is known, thanks to the Soviet Union's insistence and its constructive approach in the course of the meeting on Iceland's soil, an accord on starting full-scale negotiations on stopping nuclear tests was almost reached. However, as soon as 16 October -- that is, literally 3 days after the end of the close of the meeting at Reykjavik -- the nuclear test range in the state of Nevada began to speak again. And now another powerful test has been carried out, the 23d since the introduction of the Soviet moratorium.

The Washington revision of Reykjavik and the attempts to reconsider the basic aspects of the mutual understandings reached there manifest themselves, first of all, in my opinion, in the continuation of nuclear tests. I think that this is not by chance: Washington is geared toward continuing the arms race, not iliminating it. We, of course, do not want this; we do not want the arms race like all peoples do not want it. But I, for example, understand those Soviet people who send letters to newspapers and to television stations expressing their anxiety over the fact that the Soviet Union is continuing its unilateral moratorium while the United States carries out more and more nuclear tests. We will never forgo the security of our state and our people. So one cannot delay; for the time being there is still time left. While the Soviet moratorium is in force the United States can join it, be it today or tomorrow. This, after all, is required by common sense: One must not miss a historic chance.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION -- QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD141623 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Nov 86

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program, presented by Sergey Pravdin, all-union radio international affairs commentor, with Sergey Losev, director general of TASS; Melor Sturua, IZVESTIYA international observer; Boris Levchenko, Moscow radio's Delhi correspondent; radio commentator Nadyezhda Ryasova; Igor Surguchev, international affairs journalist; and Vladimir Pasko, international affairs journalist]

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Our mailbag contains numerous letters, the authors of which express support for the peace-loving foreign policy course of the CPSU and of the Soviet government, resolutely condemning the carrying out of nuclear tests by the United States, the Washington administration's attempts to attain military superiority over the USSR, its desire to distort the accords reached during the Soviet-American summit meeting, and to replace the Reykjavik package with a new one, the so-called Vienna package. [passage omitted]

Esteemed comrades, at our request, Sergey Andreyevich Losev, director general of TASS, will reply to your letters connected with various aspects of the USSR's campaign to ban nuclear arms and preserve peace on our planet. Our listeners ask, in particular, what characterizes the USSR's position at the latest, sixth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, which ended on 12 November?

[Losev] Our country proceeds from the fact that it must be guided at the Geneva talks by the Reykjavik package in its entirety by the principles on which an accord was reached during the last Soviet-American summit. Any other way is false and leads up a blind alley. During the meeting the capital of Iceland, and on the basis of the bold and forward-looking proposals made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU General Committee, the sides came to agree that all types of strategic offensive weapons belonging to the USSR and to the United States can and should be completely eliminated by 1996. An accord was also reached concerning complete elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe and on a radical reduction of these missiles in Asia.

In exchange for these major soviet concessions the United States would have had to renounce attempts to attain military superiority with the aid of the Star Wars program; to pledge to observe strictly all the provisions of the ABM Treaty, which has no time-limit, and for at least the next 10 years, to refrain from using the right to abrogate this treaty. The USSR insisted on banning the tests of the space elements of the antimissile defense in space and proposed that mutually acceptable accords to reached to ban antisatellite weapons. However, the U.S. Administration refused to undertake these obligations and freeze th SDI program. The proposals the Soviet delegation submitted in Geneva on 7 November concerning the entire range of nucler and space arms are based on Reykjavik and provide an opportunity ao return the talks to a sound footing and to attain progress. It is now up to the American side.

The U.S. Administration is currently attempting to break up and dismember the package of Soviet proposals, to take from the negotiating table what is to their greatest convenience, ignoring what is not to its liking, to continue the Star Wars program, and at the same time, to compel the USSR to reduce its strategic arsenal.

However, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized, eliminating nuclear weapons as a means of deterring U.S. aggression, only to receive in exchange a threat from space is something that only political simpletons can agree to, and there are no such people within the Soviet leadership. All our proposals put forward in Reykjavik are objectively linked to the central, strategic arms systems. Our concessions are, likewise, a part of the package. If there is going to be no package, neither are there going to be concessions. One cannot wage a nuclear war in the nuclear era; it is impossible to win it. [passage omitted]

[Pravdin] International public opinion is increasingly convinced that following the Soviet-American summit the U.S. Administration is trying to revise Reykjavik's results at any price. How is one to explain this?

[Losev] Indeed, the U.S. Administration's climb-down [spolzaniye] from the positions reached in Reykjavik can now be seen with the naked eye. This conclusion is confirmed by the U.S. delegation's conduct at the Vienna meeting of the CSCE participant states and also at the Geneva talks. In Geneva, the U.S. delegation is hampering the implementation of the goal of a radical reduction of nuclear arms, contrary to the accords reached concerning the elimination, by the end of 1996, of all strategic offensive weapons. But in Reykjavik, President Reagan stated outright: If we agree that all nuclear weapons are to be eliminated by the end of a 10-year period, we can convey this accord to our delegations in Geneva so they can prepare a treaty. At the Geneva talks, with the aim of attaining unilateral military advantages, the U.S. delegation insists on the elimination of only ballistic missiles, which represent the chief element of the Soviet strategic deterrent forces.

After all, Washington would like to exclude strategic bombers, of which the United States possesses almost four times as many as the USSR, as well as long-range cruise missiles, from the range of arms subject to reductions. At the INF session, the Americans are unsuccessfully trying to rule out the question of medium-range missiles out of the package. As for the Star Wars program, the U.S. side is striving to continue, unhampered, with the development and testing of space arms and to retain the right to abrogate the ABM Treaty, which bans the development and testing within the field of the ABM system. [passage omitted]

[Pravdin] At almost all Soviet-American meetings the U.S. Administration raises the question of regional conflicts. Many of our listeners ask: What, in reality, is the official Washington approach toward eliminating the hotbeds of tension in the world and what makes it differ from our country's approach?

[Losev] Of course you know that our country has put forward specific proposals to attain an equitable political settlement of the situation in nearly all regions of the world, whether in the region of the Pacific Ocean, Near East or the south of Africa. At the same time, the U.S. Administration, while paying lip service to the cause of eliminating hotbeds of tension, in reality, and under the cover of this talk, implements a policy of neoglobalism, striving to turn the world into its fiefdom and to impose the laws of the jungle on international relations, to suppress by force the peoples' desire for freedom and national independence.

The latest example of this is President Reagan's decision to annex, de facto, Micronesia, to turn Micronesia into a U.S. military and strategic bridgehead in the Western Pacific, posing a threat to the security of the entire Asian — Pacific Ocean region. In essence, the current U.S. Administration is heading toward opening, in the Asian-Pacific Ocean region, a second front against the socialist community, toward turning this region into an arena of military and political confrontation.

After all, it is precisely under U.S. influence that the military triangle Washington - Tokyo - Seoul is beginning to take shape. In Central America, Reagan's administration, ignoring the Contadora group's view and the decisions of the International Court in The Hague, is continuing, through the Contras, the undeclared war to topple the legitimate Sandinist government of Nicaragua. Louder and louder appeals can be heard in the Washington corridors of power for open, armed intervention against Nicaragua, as through the bitter experience of the Vietnamese adventure did not exist. In the Near and Middle East, the United States, acting as one with its strategic ally, Israel, is striving to frustrate all opportunities for an equitable settlement of the explosive situation there. That is precisely why Washington and Tel Aviv are opposing in every way the convocation of an international conference on the Near East.

Or else, let us, for instance, take the U.S. attitude toward the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq, this senseless war that has already been dragging on for 7 years and has cost Iran and Iraq almost 1 million killed and wounded. Officially, the U.S. Administration alleges that it is observing strict neutrality in its attitude to this fratricidal war and that it supports the speediest possible end to this war.

And in reality? It has become public knowledge recently that Robert McFarlane, the former national security adviser to the U.S. President, made a secret trip to Tehran on the instructions of the White House in mid-September this year. He flew to the capital of Iran with a forged Irish passport, a small volume of the Bible autographed by President Reagan and the gift of a cake in the shape of a large key with which the administration wanted symbolically to open up relations between Iran and America, broken following the overthrow of the Shah's regime. They say that the cake was eaten, still in the airport, by the Islamic revolution guards. What, however, is amazing here, is not this article of confectionary, but the essence of McFarlane's secret mission. It transpires that during the talks with the representatives of the Iran Foreign Ministry and with a high-ranking officer of the Iranian army, McFarlane promised to resume deliveries of U.S. military weapons and technical equipment to Iran. Moreover, according to the data of a Lebanese weekly, the United States has already delivered to Iran spare parts for aircraft, tanks and radar. One batch of spare parts was delivered on board four U.S. transport aircraft from a U.S. Air Force base in the Philippines and the main deliveries were carried out through Israel, with the personal approval of the U.S. President, of Poindexter, the President's national security adviser, and Casey, the CIA director.

Israel, THE WASHINGTON POST writes in connection with this, is interested in seeing the Iran - Iraq war continue, so that Iraq's hands are tied militarily, rendering it unable to participate actively in the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries. The United States is just as interested in fanning up this conflict, so as to strengthen its position in the region and create a pretext to expand its interference in the Persian Gulf zone. It is no coincidence that McFarlane admitted that his mission was dictated by long-term strategic U.S. interests in the Near and Middle East.

This entire operation was surrounded by a veil of misinformation, hyprocisy and lies. At a time when U.S. Secretary of State Shultz assured the Arab League that the United States was not supporting Iran in its war against Iraq, the U.S. National Security Council was busy delivering arms to Iran. It is now becoming obvious, concludes the U.S. (Cox) Information Service that our government told lies not only to our enemies, but also to our allies, to the entire population of the country.

The U.S. Administration's assurances concerning its desire to settle regional conflicts -- what are they really worth? [passage omitted]

FURTHER COMMENTS ON U.S. ARMS SALES TO IRAN

Biryukov Criticizes NSC

LD171850 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 17 Nov 86

["Liars from U.S. National Security Council" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- TASS commentatory Vadim Biryukov writes:

Admiral Poindexter, trying to justify secret U.S. arms deliveries to Iran, said in an interview to the NBC television network that the administration is not seeking the overthrow of the Iranian Government, that it is only that the present policies of that state should be changed.

From the viewpoint of an official high in the U.S. National Security Council, the body, which as is known, implements actions of state terrorism -- such as masterminding the "undeclared war" against Nicaragua and Afghanistan, staging aggressions against Grenada and Libya -- the statement that Washington was not intending to overthrow the Iranian Government was, apparently, to sound reassuring, as almost a friendly pat on the shoulder: We have not overthrown anyone, see, so there is no need to raise a hullabaloo.

But if one proceeds from generally recognized standards of international relations, then the admission that they in the U.S. National Security Council believe they have a right to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states cannot but cause indignation.

Meanwhile what is involved here is not only a glaring act of interference in domestic affairs, but also obvious deception. In the spring of the current year, the U.S. press reported that some twenty Americans and Israelis were arrested on charges of attempting to secretly supply arms to Iran. The scope of a secret operation involving a contract of two billion dollars was quite shocking even then. But the White House feigned indignation and denied its involvement in the affair. It has now become apparent that that contract exists, that various types of arms are secretly delivered by the USA to Iran. What is particularly important is that this is done contrary to the publicly proclaimed neutrality of the Reagan administration in the Iran-Iraq conflict.

The arms deliveries to Iran lead to the dragging out of the Iran-Iraq war, which is one of the decisive factors of the course of the United States and its ally, Israel. This course is advantageous for both the United States and Israel since it enables them to keep Persian Gulf countries in constant fear of military interference and to impose political and economic terms on them.

No matter what denials can be made by John Poindexter and his colleagues in the U.S. National Security Council, pressure and outright interference in the affairs of other states is a characteristic method of the Washington administration in the international arena.

Tsvetou: Move Shows 'Cunning'

LD171936 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 17 Nov 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] You are watching U.S. President Reagan making a public admission that his administration supplied arms to Iran, which is waging a war with Iraq. [Video shows Reagan at microphone] The President also cited the reasons motiviating him to conclude a secret deal: these were the desire to renew relations with Iran, to put an end to the Iran-Iraq war, put a stop to state terrorism and bring about the return of American hostages. However, the President's statement was immediately subjected to criticism by U.S. Democratic congressmen. Senator Patrick Leahy described the sale of arms to Iran as pernicious policy. The Senator accused the President of breaking the law, insofar as the President ordered the CIA to conceal the contacts with Iran from the Congress. O'Neill, the former speaker of the House of Representatives, pointed out that the President wanted to exchange the hostages for weapons from speculative reasons: in order to help his party gather a few more votes at the recent midterm elections.

It has come to light that the deliveries of arms to Iran were carried out with the assistance of Israel. Shamir, the Israeli prime minister, did not want to admit this directly. But his statement, that israel always tries to help the United States, leaves no doubt about the active role Israel played in the U.S.-Iranian deal.

Now a few words about what President Reagan himself actually said. He said that the arms were delivered in order to create an atmosphere in which it would prove possible to resume relations with Iran. The President was quite blunt here. However, the President did not want to resume relations with the present Iranian leadership at all, but with the pro-U.S. elements. John Poindexter, the President's national security aide, gave away Reagan's intentions: He said that the United States supplied military equipment to moderate elements in the country so that they might acquire greate influence and make use of it. President Reagan went on to assert that he aspired to put an end to the Iran-Iraq war. But this is what Martin, Pentagon correspondent of the CBS television network reports: In supplying Iran with antitank weapons and surface-to-air missiles, the administration at the same time gave the green light for the leading military industrial firms to conclude contracts with Iraq, so as not to allow an Iranian victory in the war. That is, to stoke up the Iran-Iraq war even more -- that is the goal that the U.S. President has really set himself.

In launching into trading in arms with Iran, the President thought to put an end to state terrorism -- that is how he explained his action, at any rate. But is it really possible to put an end to terrorism if the return of hostages was generously paid for with military supplies?

Senator Patrick Leahy described the President's actions as dilittante. I do not agree with him here. If one takes as one's point of departure that the President was caught unawares, then his actions were indeed not distinguished by professionalism. But if one is talking about the essence of those actions, then these are not dilettante, but rather show a refined cunning, since they have even further exacerbated the already explosive situation in the Near East.

Korionov Hits U.S. 'Deception'

PM171047 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Commentator's Column": "How Can They Be Believed?"]

[Text] Official Washington is imploring the U.S. press, the U.S. allies, and the entire outside world: Do not stir up the subject of secret shipments of U.S. arms to Iran, at some point the administration "will tell everything," but "do not obstruct it" for the time being. It seems, however, that these subterfuges will hardly deceive anyone.

For a number of years now the present administration has been importunately holding itself to be a real "fighter against terrorism." The falsity of this stance was obvious to everyone. The ruling elite of the largest imperialist power which crucified defenseless, Grenada, organized wars by "contras" against Nicaragua and many other freedom-loving countries, and -- to put it briefly -- made state terrorism the foundation of its foreign policy, this elite is holding itself to be a force opposing terrorism!

Nonetheless, people in the White House stubbornly drew up lists proscribing countries which Washington arbitrarily proclaimed to be "terrorists." Iran was included on this list. The U.S. Administration entreated its allies not to have anything to do with that country.

Suddenly this structure of falsehoods collapsed. It became known that weapons made in the United States have been supplied to Iran for some 18 months. When this entire unseemly story came to light, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs Poindexter imperturbably declared: "Deception is a legitimate means of foreign policy."

Of course, the use of deception in foreign policy is a typical feature of bourgeois diplomacy. But history also teaches us something else: This type of deception has been paid for by the people, and it has been paid for in blood. Let us recall just one example: Washington needed a pretext for the military invasion of Vietnam, and suddenly it resorted to deception -- the fabricated story of an "attack" by Vietnamese ships on U.S. ships in the Gulf of Tonkin. Everyone remembers this deception's cost in blood by the people of Vietnam and the United States.

But the present adminstration goes even further: It openly proclaims deception to be a "legitimate means" and elevates it to the status of some kind of "principle" of its foreign policy. Just imagine the blood and unprecedented calamities which may be the cost to the peoples of such a policy based on deception and perfidy.

The real image of this administration is revealed time and again for the whole world to see. It is natural that a legitimate question is being asked with increasing persistence everywhere: How is it possible to believe those who say one thing and do the exact opposite?

Arab Envoys 'Outraged'

LD180832 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS -- TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin reports:

A meeting of ambassadors of 16 Arab League countries was held in Washington on Monday against the background of the growing scandal over U.S. secret arms shipments to Iran.

As follows from the statements made at the meeting the Arab states are outraged by Washington's unpardonable interference in the Iran-Iraq armed conflict.

"In general opinion," said Clovis Maksoud, a spokesman for the Arab League, "the covert arms sales to Iran are a direct violation of assurances Wahington has given to the Arab countries."

'TOP PRIORITY' DISCUSSES U.S. ELECTIONS

LD152253 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 15 Nov 86

["Top Priority" program with Vladimir Pozner, Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of Moscow's United States and Canada Studies Institute]

[Text] [Pozner] The subject today is, basically, the results of the mid-term elections in the United States.

Before we actually begin the discussion I would like to say that although there has been a lot of talk about the fact that the Democrats gained control of the Senate, and much has been said about that, I think we should keep in mind that the tradition, at least in this century, has been that basically a lame duck President even when he has had the Senate, has lost it at mid-term elections. So in that sense what happened is really not revolutionary or totally unexpected. But perhaps the framework within which it happened, the concrete conditions of the way it happened, perhaps there is there something worthy of exploration. At any rate, I'd like us to take a look at that and perhaps you, Dr Bogdanov, could begin?

[Bogdanov] First of all, the Americans themselves should make their own assessments and to make their own conclusions and I quite agree with you Vladimir, that in the American political life, in the American political tradition, that the loss of Senate, it's not something dramatic, it's not something unexpected; it's the usual, you know, American cycle, if you like, political cycle. By the way, I belong to Soviet researchers who believe in cycles in American politics. I don't know how is my friend Sergey, but we have discussed that with him many times and I believe that he also belongs [Plekhanov heard agreeing in the background] to the believers in the cycles in the American politics.

There are several points I would like at the same time to emphasize. You know, I was a little bit, you know, surprised how the President, such a popular president as President Reagan is, could risk his popularity [laughter], his whole political weight and if you like his political might, putting everything on those elections. You might remember, of course you remember, that this administration and the President himself were telling to the electorate: Look, that is a kind of referendum. Or you vote for my politics, or you vote against me [sentence as heard].

What is it, I still wonder. My question is, you know, did the administration expect those results, or they were so sure about their success that they could risk everything, you know? And so far I have no answer to that.

[Pozner] Well, let's take a look at that, incidentally. What do you think, Dr Plekhanov, do you think that when President Reagan was saying: vote for me for the last time by voting for the Republican candidate, did the Republicans really think that they were going to win, or was this kind of a last resort appeal? How do you see that?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think it was both. It was a last resort appeal because they were expecting that they would incur some losses in these elections, especially they were worried about their control of the Senate, but at the same time they thought that the weapon that they had, namely the personal popularity of President Reagan was a potent one. And I think they overestimated the depth of the popularity of the President. Those who have studied the public opinion polls over the last 6 years have noted that there was a regular, persistent gap between the personal popularity and the general level of approval of President Reagan and the disapproval of many of the specific policies that the Reagan administration was pursuing.

[Pozner] Tell me, both of you, are you aware of the fact that certain Soviet journalists who are well known in this country have assessed -- not all of them, but some -- have assessed the results of these elections as being disastrous to the President, as a kind of an expression on the part of the American people that we want no more, we want no part and parcel of the present policies? Would you agree with that kind of an assessment, or do you think it's an overstatement?

[Bogdanov] You know, I am a liberal . . .

[Pozner] You are?

[Bogdanov] I am a liberal and that means I respect any point of view. It doesn't mean I agree, but I respect and I believe that any Soviet journalist has a right to express his point of view.

[Pozner] Well no doubt about that, yes.

[Bogdanov] In that sense I am liberal. I am liberal in many other respects too. But I would very much object to that point of view, that that was a disaster for the President, you know.

[Pozner] You don't agree with it?

[Bogdanov] Well, I don't agree with that and I would say it's rather an exaggeration, you know, which is not based on facts. At the same time, of course, I wouldn't say the President (?is still) in the same, you know, category of political, you know, might as he was before the elections.

[Pozner] You think he's lost a little bit?

[Bogdanov] He lost a little bit, you know, he lost a little bit. My question is: Is he really a lame duck President, as any other President in the American history starting his seventh year of presidency?

If you judge by figures, by arithmetical, you know, factors, maybe he is a lame duck because he lost the Senate, a very important body of law-making, you know. Maybe. But let's see. I would prefer to wait and see.

[Pozner] Yes. do you want to say something, Dr Plekahnov?

[Plekhanov] I think if we look back on those 6 years we have seen in policies of the Reagan administration kind of a vacillation between an agressive, partisan approach to politics, both domestic and foreign policy, and a bipartisan, more traditional approach. There have been movements back and forth. Some of the initiatives on the part of President Reagan were clearly bipartisan. Others were very partisan and in someways even extremist. Having the control of the Senate I think facilitated a more partisan approach. Now I think the control that the Democrats have gained over the Senate will increase the tendency of the Reagan administration to take into account the views of the opposition party. In that sense I think we will see a more centrist kind of a policy in the Reagan administration.

[Pozner] Both of you, as experts in the area of American politics, would probably agree that elections are rarely based on external, international issues. It's usually the domestic issue that's the most important. . .

[Plekhanov] Unless there is a war. . .

[Pozner] Unless you have Vietnam. . .

[Bogdanov] Some dramatic event. . .

[Pozner] In this particular case I would again think that you would both agree that international affairs played a very important role in the campaign, specifically, or shall we say specially after Reykjavik and the whole issue of SDI came to the forefront and seemed to be one of the major issues. Now, if you agree with that, and I find it difficult to imagine that you would not agree, so I'm saying you will agree with that, would you not see the results of these elections as somehow the expression on the part of the voting Americans that they are not all that enthralled with SDI and that perhaps what happened at Reykjavik, the fact that the President did not find it possible to agree with the Soviet Union, turned them off to a certain extent? What do you think?

[Bogdanov] I would pay a million bucks, you know, to know the right answer to that question! [laughter; in background Pozner apologizes for not having this sum] But unfortunately I have no objective, you know, facts to prove my views but I have, rather, political instinct and feeling. And my feelings and political instinct tell me that those two problems were very much in the front of the elections. They were silent, you know, factors. I would put it like that. Not vocal but silent factors. And electorate, voters, they had it behind their minds, you know, Reykjavik and all these nuclear problems. I don't know how that impacted on their, you know moving into this or that direction, but I have no slightest doubt that those were very major silent factors in defining electorate's position on voting for or against.

[Plekhanov] I think that it did play a role, foreign affairs did play a role and Reykjavik did play a role. And I think voters were kind of disoriented as to what the President's policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union really was. On the hand he was ready to, or apparently ready to, go far in the matter of nuclear disarmament.

On the other hand he emphasized the hard line against the Russians. And maybe in the mind of the President that was a logical combination; being tough with the Russian forces them to make good concessions. But in [the] practical world, in practical politics, it doesn't amount to a workable formula for Soviet-American relations. And I think that this ambiguity in the President's approach did produce a negative impression on the minds of the voters and so the Democrats, I think, hammered on that theme, and apparently successfully.

[Pozner] You talk about concessions that the Soviet made, and it's true that at Reykjavik some very important ones were made. There were also some concessions on the American's part, in particular when they agreed not to speak any more about ceilings and sub-ceilings, or limits and sub-limits, just to go ahead and forget about those things. Now, according to the information we have, in Geneva the Americans have gone back to the pre-Reykjavik stance of again insisting upon limits and sub-limits and what have you.

[Plekhanov] Backsliding. . .

[Pozner] How do you think the electorate is going to look at that in the United States? I mean, how do people relate to this see-sawing of now you see it, now you don't, here it is and here it isn't, and so on?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, I'm afraid we will have clarified answer to your question at the end of the next year, at the presidential election. I mean, it's a very difficult question. We have no instruments to measure. There is only one point, which is absolutely clear to me: that will impact very much because at the level of national elections foreign policy issues are playing always a big role, you know. But still I would wait, you know, with my qualified answer to your very important question.

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] I think one could make a plausible point that, well, maybe Reykjavik was for President Reagan primarily an election ploy and before the election you had an apparent agreement, a desire to go half way on the part of the United States. After the election you see a backsliding toward the old position. So if the summit was designed simply to impress the voters in order to keep the Senate. . .

[Pozner interrupting] It was a Soviet initiative, the summit. It was not the Americans who thought up Reykjavik.

[Plekhanov] That's right, but the Americans were insisting on a summit or some sort of an agreement before the election. That was clear, I think. They really needed something before the election. And now that there's backsliding on virtually every issue.

[Bogdanov] Because they don't need them any more, it's all over, so elections are over.

[Plekhanov] That, I think, raises a lot of questions about what really the intentions are of this administration in Soviet-American relations.

[Pozner] One question I would like to ask, as time here is running out on us today, were you not surprised by the really -- even by American standards -- low voter turn-out? I mean, when I saw that barely 37 percent of the electorate had actually voted, which means that the overwhelming majority just didn't even go to the polls, isn't that a significant statement in itself?

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, it's very significant and it's a trend in the American, you know, political life of the last decade, you know. It's a trend, very significant trend. What does it mean? First of all, to my mind, the electorate has no hope that these elections or electing this or that (?fellow), they can change anything, you know. Number two, people are getting tired with some people being in the office too long and they just don't feel like going to give, they prefer to stay at home, you know. But it's very significant, if you think it over, to make a proper political (?judgment).

[Pozner] Isn't it a reflection of some kind of disillusionment, or there's a great French saying which is: The more it changes, the more it's the same thing"? I mean, isn't there the feeling now in Americans that no matter which way you vote, no matter what you do, nothing really ever changes? That's the only way I can read this particular incredibly low voter turn-out. I mean, you have 63 percent of the population that doesn't even bother to go vote. That, to me, is a very, very powerful statement. What do you think, Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] I agree. The high level of absenteeism is a traditional thing for a mid-term election, but recent mid-term elections have really set some records in that area. And there have been studies made of the reasons why people don't go to the polls, why the absenteeism is so high. And there are several reasons. There are technical reasons -- some people simply don't bother to register to vote or they change their residence...

[Pozner] That's a very small percent...

[Plekhanov] Right, well the largest category of non-voters are people who are really disappointed about politics, have been alienated from politics because they don't see any rational way how their own desires and ideas can be put into practice at the governmental level and they really adopt an attitude of plague on both your houses. Nothing really changes no matter who occupies the public offices, and that reflects a long and deep trend in American politics, namely the alienation of a growing number of people from the political process and from the political system. There is a debate in American politics as to whether it's good or bad, because some people at the top of the American Government think that, well, you know, the fewer of them take part the better it is. If people don't care, well we don't care either. Others think that there should be as broad involvement of people in the political process as possible. I think that in recent decades the attitude that the fewer of them take part, the better for the stability of the system, that view has gained greater weight than the previous one, the more traditional democratic approach that the people should be involved and so on and so forth. So I don't know what approach will gain an upper hand in the future, because you know there is a critical mass. When people are alienated, at a certain stage it's okay for the stability but that may be like a powder keg which is, you know...

[Pozner interrupting] Well, thank you very much Dr Plekhanov, Dr Bogdanov. I would like to say in conclusion that I have always felt that when people don't vote that means they have no choice. So what it means to me is that basically the choice between the Democrats and the Republicans is really no choice at all, otherwise I feel people would vote, if there was a clearly defined choice in both domestic and foreign policies.

And that's it for today. This is Vladimir Pozner wishing you good listening on behalf of "Top Priority". We'll be back a week from today at the same time, so please tune in.

SEISMOLOGISTS ARRIVE FOR EXPERIMENT IN U.S.

LD122100 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT 12 Nov 86

[Text] New York November 12 TASS -- Under an agreement between the National Resources Defence Council of the USA and the USSR Academy of Sciences, a group of Soviet scientists arrived in the United States.

In the framework of this agreement, American seismologists had earlier started in the Soviet Union an experiment for verification of the non-holding of nuclear tests. Last July they installed special equipment in the area of the Soviet nuclear range in Kazakhstan to register tremour of the surface. Senior staff Scientist of the National Resources Defence Council Thomas Cochran said that seismic instruments installed in the USSR confirm that the Soviet Union honours its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear testing.

After procrastinations the U.S. Department of State issued entrance visas to Soviet scientists, but they have not been allowed to visit areas in Nevada and California where it has been suggested to install seismic equipment. So while American scientists, as the NEW YORK TIMES writes, have been staying near the Soviet nuclear range since last July, scientists from the USSR can only meet their colleagues, study geological maps of the suggested areas and check U.S. seismic equipment.

Speaking at a press conference in La Jolla, California, Thomas Cochran emphasized the importance of the Soviet-U.S. project. He said its aim is to show real possibility for verifying a moratorium on nuclear testing by the sides. This should encourage a world-wide ban on such testing so as to prevent the development of new kinds of nuclear weapons. Cochran said that the council suggested the participation in the experiment to the Reagan administration. But Washington refused, declaring that it is against a moratorium on nuclear testing.

Corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, Chief of the Seismology Department of the Institute of the Physics of the Earth of the USSR Academy of Sciences Igor Nersesov, who took part in the press conference, emphasized that the main task of the joint experiment is to show that termination of nuclear testing is possible. He refuted the assertions of representatives of the U.S. Administration that the experiment is of propaganda nature.

MRP'S BATMONH, DELEGATION LEAVE FOR DPRK

Seen Off By Sodnom, Others

LD170943 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0856 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 17 Nov (TASS) -- A party-government delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic, led by J. Batmonh, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] and chairman of the People's Great Hural Presidium of the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR], left here today for Pyongyang at the invitation of Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers party of Korea and DPRK president on an official friendly visit to the DPRK.

The delegation was seen off at the airport by D. Sodnom, member of the Politburo of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, and other Mongolian party and government leaders.

Vladivostok Stopover

PM171923 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Mongolian Delegation's Sojourn"]

[Text] Vladivostok, 17 Nov -- A Mongolian party and government delegation headed by J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium, arrived in Vladivostok today en route to the DPRK.

The guests were greeted at the airport by V. D. Safronov, second secretary of the Maritime CPSU Kraykom; V.F. Lutsenko, chairman of the Maritime Krayisolkom; and other officials.

The delegation members laid flowers at the V.I. Lenin monument and the "Red Banner Pacific Fleet Combat Glory" memorial and visited the legendary "S-56" floating museum and a Red Banner Pacific Fleet ship.

Arrive, Greeted By Kim Il-Song

LD180256 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0230 GMT 18 Nov 86

["Jhambyn Batmonh Has Arrived on a Visit to Pyongyang" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Pyongyang, 18 Nov (TASS) -- A party-state delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic, headed by Jhambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic, arrived today in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on an official friendly visit. At Pyongyang airport the delegation was met by Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers party and president of Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and by other party and state figures of the DPRK.

GORBACHEV CONGRATULATES LAOS' KAYSONE PHOMVIHAN

PM171451 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 First Edition P 1

[Greetings message from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee, received on 15 November]

[Text] To Comrade Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee

Comrade Kaysone Phomvihan, in the name of the CPSU Central Committee and myself, I would like to express congratulations on the occasion of your reelection as general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee. All Soviet people are well aware of and highly value your great contributions to the cause of the Lao revolution, to the struggle for peace and socialism, and to the strengthening of the fraternal friendship between the Soviet Union and Laos.

In our country we have followed with lively interest the proceedings of the fourth LPRP Congress, which reviewed the results of the party's activities during the years of people's power, and which will arrange various concrete guidelines for Laos' advance along the path of socialist construction.

We hail and share the determination expressed at the congress by the Lao communists to continue strengthening and developing the all-round cooperation between the CPSU and the LPRP and between the Soviet Union and the LPDR on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

Comrade Kaysone Phomvihan, I wish you, the party leaders, your country, the communists, and all people of Laos success in implementing the resolutions of the Fourth LPRP Congress.

With communist salutations.

M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

ALIYEV RETURNS FROM VISIT TO LAO CONGRESS

LD161816 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS -- The CPSU delegation led by Geydar Aliyev returned to Moscow from Vientiane today.

At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party (LPRP), the delegation had attended the Fourth Congress of the LPRP.

At the airport the delegation were met by Mikhail Solomentsev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee, and by senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON LIGACHEV VISIT TO HELSINKI

Meets with President Koivisto

LD131542 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] Helsinki November 13 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yegor Ligachev, who heads a CPSU delegation met with President of the Republic of Finland Mauno Koivisto today.

Yegor Ligachev conveyed to the head of the friendly Finnish state greetings and good wishes from the general secretary of CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. Both sides expressed profound satisfaction with a fruitful development of the dialogue between the leaders of the USSR and Finland, the dialogue that is so much needed for the ensurance of the steady development of Soviet-Finnish relations, for lending fresh impetus to it. Mauno Koivisto confirmed the invitation earlier conveyed to Mikhail Gorbachev to make an official visit to Finland.

Yegor Ligachev and Mauno Koivisto noted that confidence and goodneighbourliness have been firmly established in Soviet-Finnish relations that are based on the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. The state of and prospects for cooperation between the USSR and Finland in various spheres have been discussed in a broad context during the conversation.

Attaching priority importance to the consolidation and widening of interaction between the USSR and Finland in the commercial and economic sphere, Yegor Ligachev and Mauno Koivisto emphasised the resolve of both sides to ensure a high level of Soviet-Finnish trade which is envisaged by inter-governmental agreements for 1986-1990. The sides expressed the opinion that this can be achieved only by joint intensive efforts, by developing such promising forms of cooperation as coordination and specialisation in production, the construction of large facilities, the setting up of joint enterprises.

Unanimous opinion has been confirmed about the need to bring fuller into play the potential of cooperation of the two countries, to step up further Soviet-Finnish cooperation, which by its example promotes effectively the assertion fo the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems in international relations. This is particularly important in conditions when the situation in the world has complicated. [sentence as received]

In this connection the sides pointed to the need to cherish a high level of confidence in relations between the Soviet and Finnish peoples, to cut short resolutely the attempts to weaken it. Showing care for the future of our relations, it is important to strengthen the climate of goodneighbourliness, to bring up the young generations as firm and vigorous supporters of the course of friendship, Yegor Ligachev said. Mauno Koivisto expressed full agreement with this approach.

It was emphasized that now that a qualitatively new situation developed after Reykjavik and the struggle for nuclear disarmament reached higher ground, the importance of persistent efforts of all countries, large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear, of those belonging to the military-political alliances and those outside them, the importance of concerted actions is growing particularly in securing that a historic chance for a cardinal solution of the problems of war and peace should not be lost.

Pointing out that there is no return to a situation which preceded the Reykjavik meeting, President Mauno Koivisto declared that alongside considerable reduction in nuclear weapons an agreement on prevention of the spread of the arms race to outer space should be concluded.

Both sides are of the opinion that the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe and the implementation of confidence-building measures in the area and adjoining seas, the measures proposed by President Mauno Koivisto, would be an important contribution to consolidating peace. Having confirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to promote the implementation of these Finnish initiatives, Yegor Ligachev informed the president of Finland of the additional steps of the Soviet side aimed at consolidating stability in the north European region.

Talks With Finnish CP Figures

LD152210 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1101 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Helsinki, 15 Nov (TASS) — Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is heading a CPSU delegation which is currently here at the invitation of the Finnish Social Democratic Party, today had a conversation with Arvo Aalto, chairman of the Finnish Communist Party [SKP], Esko Vainionpaa, general secretary of the party, and Olavi Poikolainen, head of the SKP Central Committee International Department. A conversation also took place between the leaders of the Central Committee of SKP (United) Organizations: Taisto Sinisalo, the chairman; Yrjoe Hakanen, vice chairman; and Jouko Kajanoja, general secretary.

Yegor Ligachev informed the representataives of Finnish communists about the work of the CPSU in reneving society, accelerating the socioeconomic development of the country, in implementing the decisions of the April (1985) plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the 27th CPSU Congress, and about the approach of the CPSU to resolving the cardinal task of the modern day, removing the nuclear threat and establishing peaceful cooperation between states.

The Finnish comrades talked about the work of communists in Finland in defending the vital interests of working people, their social and democratic rights, for strengthening friendship between the Finnish and Soviet peoples, and international solidarity of all progressive forces in the fight against the nuclear threat and for European and international security.

The conversations passed off in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Vitaliy Shaposhnikov, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vladimir Sobolev, USSR ambassador to Finland, took part in the conversations.

Meets Center Party Leaders

PM171425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

["CPSU Delegation in Finland" — PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Helsinki, 15 Nov — In Helsinki, Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has met with Vayrynen, chairman of the Center Party, and Kaariainen, secretary general of the party. In a friendly conversation questions relating to Soviet-Finnish relations and also the development of contacts between the CPSU and the Center Party were discussed. The conviction was expressed to the effect that these contacts make a useful contribution to the consolidation of relations of good-neighborliness and cooperation between the USSR and Finland and promote the joining of forces of the public of the two countries in the struggle for peace and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

V.S. Shaposhvikov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, and V.M. Sobolev, USSR ambassador to Finland, took part in the talk.

Visit To Industrial Center

PM171447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[Text] Helsinki, 15 Nov — The CPSU Delegation led by Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited the dairy factory of the VALIO, central association of dairy cooperatives, and made a trip to Tampere, one of the country's large industrial centers. The delegation is here at the invitation of the executive committee of the Finnish Social Democratic Party. In Tampere, the delegation was welcomed by Rantanen, the mayor of the town. The CPSU Delegation viewed the exhibition at the Vladimir Ilyich Museum, which was opened in 1946 in the building in which the first conference of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party took place. Comrade Ligachev laid flowers at a commemorative plaque mounted on the museum building and made an entry in the visitors' book. The CPSU delegation also visited a factory of the Tamrock joint-stock company which specializes in the production of rock drilling machines. A considerable proportion of the output of the Tamrock firms goes to the Soviet Union. There were conversations with the managers and workers of the enterprise.

During Ye.K. Kigachev's meeting with representatives of Finnish business circles opinions were exchanged on questions of further deepening trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and Finland in the sphere of production sharing, joint scientific research and design work, and the creation of joint enterprises.

Communique on Ligachev Visit

PM171145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

["Communique on the Talks Between CPSU and Finnish Social Democratic Party [SDP] Delegations" — PRAVDA headline]

[Text] A delegation of the CPSU visited Finland 12-15 November 1986, at the invitation of the Executive Committee of the Finnish SDP. Talks were held between the CPSU and SDP delegations. [paragraph continues]

Taking part in them, on the CPSU's side, were: Yegor Ligachev, Politburo member and secretary of te CPSU Central Committee (head of delegation), Karl Vaino, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, Anatoliy Gerasimov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom, and Vitaliy Shaposhnikov, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee. On the SDP's side, taking part in the talks were: Kalevi Sorsa, chairman of the SDP and head of delegation, Erkki Liikanen, SDP secretary-general, Pirkko Tyolajarvi and Matti Ahde, deputy chairman of the party, Risto Tuominen, chairman of the SDP Council, Pertti Paasio, chairman of the SDP's Diet group, and Lauri Kangas, SDP secretary for international affairs.

During the talks, which passed in an atmosphere of comradely trust, there was a thorough exchange of opinions on the most topical problems of the international situation, the workers' movement, and prospects for Soviet-Finnish relations. The delegations informed each other of the activities of their parties.

The CPSU representatives described the work under way in the Soviet Union to implement the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, which are aimed at speeding up the country's socioeconomic development and at further improving the welfare of the people. They also described the basic aims and directions of the foreign policy activity of the CPSU.

For its part the SDP of Finland reported on the party's activity to ensure economic development, employment, and social equality in Finland, as well as on its struggle for peace, disarmament, and international cooperation, particularly within the framework of the Socialist International.

The SDP delegation highly evaluated the large-scale peace initiatives proposed at the 27th CPSU Congress by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the program for the elimination of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000, and proposals to create a comprehensive system of international security.

The CPSU delegation stressed the SDP's constructive role in the struggle for peace, disarmament, and detente and in the implementation of Finland's foreign policy line.

As a result of discussions it was confirmed that the approaches of both parties to the key issues of contemporary development in the world, to the problems of war and peace, and to the ways of resolving them, basically coincide or are close to each other.

The representatives of the CPSU and the SDP expressed deep concern at the strengthening of the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, and at actions directed toward transferring this into space, and at the exacerbation of crisis situations in various parts of the globe. All of this as a whole is fraught with the threat of a new war, which would mean catastrophe for all of modern civilization.

The CPSU and the SDP agree that the realities of the nuclear and space age demand a new and bold political way of thinking, a renunciation of the use of force and the threat of force in international affairs, and a persistent search for ways of political settlement of disputed issues. [paragraph continues]

This means that in international affairs one must be guided not by national egoism, but by the principles of equal security for all peoples. Both delegations stressed that examination of the issues of disarmament must be comprehensive, including nuclear, space, chemical, and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, as well as conventional arms and armed forces. For this aim to be achieved decisive actions and the mutual cooperation of all states, large and small, are needed. At the same time the need was stressed for joint efforts to be increased in defense of peace by political parties, trade unions, and antiwar movements, and other public organizations and movements, regardless of their political orientation.

In this connection the sides noted the exceptionally important significance of the Soviet-U.S. meeting at summit level at Reykjavik which was a major political event that made it possible to bring the struggle against nuclear weapons up to qualitatively new frontiers. The SDP delegation gave a high appraisal of the constructive position adopted by the Soviet side at the Reykjavik meeting. Both delegations consider it essential to continue contacts and talks on the whole complex of nuclear and space weapons in order to go on to concrete measures for disarmament on earth, preventing the militarization of space, and ensuring reliable security and peaceful conditions for the socioeconomic development of all peoples.

The delegations gave a positive assessment to the results of the first stage of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. The sides consider it important that at the meeting of representatives of the participating states in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, concrete results should be achieved in the advancement of the Pan-European process in all directions as outlined in the Helsinki Final Act. The work to strengthen confidence and security and to reduce armed forces and armaments in Europe must be continued.

The sides noted the growing topicality of Finland's initiative on setting up a nonnuclear zone in the north of Europe, which is meeting with increasingly wide suport from the peoples of this region. The SDP will continue efforts to put this initiative into practice. The CPSU delegation confirmed the readiness of the Soviet Union to promote for its part the creation of favorable conditions for its achievement.

The sides expressed the view that President M. Koivisto's proposal on measures to strengthen trust in the military sphere as applied to northern Europe and the seas adjacent to it is a constructive contribution to resolving the task of strengthening stability in this region.

One important step on the road to freeing Europe of nuclear weapons would be the creation in its central part of a nuclear-free corridor in accordance with the well-known proposal of the Olaf Palme Commission and the joint initiative of the SED Party and the SPD.

The delegations of the CPSU and the SDP, considering an end to the politics of strength and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and proceding from unconditional respect for the right of every people to social and political choice, to be necessary, the delegations of the CPSU and the SDP stated their support for the Arab peoples fighting for national self-determination, and stressed the urgency of achieving lasting peace in the Near East on the basis of the well-known decisions of the UN Security Council and by means of an international conference with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO.

They confirmed support for the national liberation movment in the south of Africa and condemned the apartheid policy practiced by the Republic of South Africa, its aggressive acts against neighboring states, and called for immediate independence for Namibia.

The solidarity of the CPSU and the SDP with the just struggle of the peoples of Chile, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and other countries in Latin America for democracy, social progress, and human rights was expressed.

During the talks the delegations of the CPSU and the SDP paid great attention to issues of Soviet-Finnish relations, which graphically demonstrate the value and fruitfulnes of implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence among states with differing social systems. The delegations made a positive assessment of the very broad and diverse relations between the USSR and Finand which have developed on the basis of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance of 1948. This treaty is also an important factor for security and peace in the north of Europe. It retains its relevance in all of its clauses in the contemporary situation too.

The delegations of the CPSU and the SDP confirmed the intention of their parties to continue in the future to actively promote the strengthening and development of good neighborliness and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Finland in all spheres, in the interests of the peoples of both countries, and of the strengthening of international peace.

The SDP representatives declared their party's determination to unswervingly follow the Paasikivi-Kekkonen foreign policy line, a course aimed at friendship with the Soviet Union on the basis of the 1948 treaty. The CPSU delegation stressed that friendly relations with Finland will continue to hold a special place in the foreign policy work of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The delegations noted the great significance of permanent personal contacts between the leading figures of both states in the cause of deepening mutual understanding and trust between the Soviet Union and Finland. In this connection it was noted that the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Mauno Koivisto of the Republic of Finland in September 1985 was an important landmark in the advancement of Soviet-Finnish relations.

The delegations took note of the existence of great opportunities to deepen and expand trading and economic cooperation between the USSR and Finland. Both parties will promote the adoption of effective measures to ensure the high level of Soviet-Finnish trade for which provision was made by international agreement for the years 1986-90, the development of cooperation in manufacturing, the establishment of joint enterprises and production facilities, and the introduction of new forms of trading and economic cooperation.

Attaching priority importance to the strengthening of mutual trust between the USSR and Finland, the CPSU and the SDP consider it necessary to resolutely resist all attempts to harm the development of Soviet-Finnish good-neighborly relations, wherever they come from.

The delegations noted with satisfaction the broadening and deepening of ties between the basic political trends in the international workers' movement, and the communist and social democratic parties. [paragraph continues]

They consider that regardles of the presence of ideological differences, cooperation between communists and social democrats assumes greater and greater significance in the struggle for peace, detente, and disarmament in the interests of the working people, for democracy and social progress. In this connection special attention was given to the ties between the CPSU and the Socialist International, which have developed further recently on disarmament questions.

Participants in the talks noted with satisfaction the positive development of relations between the CPSU and the SDP in the interests of the strengthening of friendly Soviet-Finnish relations, in the cause of struggle against the nuclear threat, and for peace and security of the peoples. The readiness of both parties was confirmed to be active in this direction in the future, in particular, to celebrate jointly the historically closely linked dates -- the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 70th anniversary of the independence of Finland.

Delegation Departs Finland

LD151437 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Helsinki November 15 TASS -- The CPSU delegation led by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Political Bureau, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has left Helsinki for Moscow today after visiting Finland at the invitation of the Social Democratic Party of Finland [SSDP].

At the airport the delegation were seen off by Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa of Finland, SDDP chairman, Erkki Liikanen, SSDP general secretary, and by other leading figures of the party.

Returns From Helsinki

LD151613 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- The CPSU Delegation led by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Political Bureau, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, returned to Moscow from Helsinki today after staying in Finland at the invitation of the leadership of the Social Democratic Party of Finland (SSDP).

At the airport the delegation were met by Lev Zaykov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and by senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

Among the welcoming party was Aarno Karhilo, the ambassador of Finland to the USSR.

TASS Criticizes UPI Report

LD142039 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1928 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 November (TASS) -- In a report from Helsinki, the UPI Agency briefly summarized the essence of the latest Soviet steps directed at strengthening stability and security in northern Europe, steps announced at a press conference by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

In particular, the agency quoted his comment on the fact that the Soviet Union has already dismantled medium-range missile-launching installations in the Kola Peninsula and a large part of the launching installations for such missiles in the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic military districts.

These steps really are deserving of being reported by newspapers, radio stations, television stations, and above all news agencies -- in the performance of their duty to society. However, UPI decided to do an additional "service" for society: It immediately quoted some or other "Finnish expert" with an English name and surname (Thomas Rice), who said that Soviet missiles had allegedly been dismantled 4 years ago now and replaced by more powerful missiles in other areas of the USSR, from where they can, it was claimed, strike more accurately at the northern areas.

TASS tasked its correspondents in Finland with seeking out the interviews, to establish the source of this information. Unfortunately, they were unable to do so, as there was no success in picking up his trail in Helsinki. But along the way the reason for the "Finnish expert's" foreign names emerged. His mother, who was born in Finland, had emigrated to the United States long ago. A few months ago, (Rice) compiled a "study" of Soviet armaments and armed forces on the Kola Peninsula, written to the standards that such "studies" are written to in across the Atlantic. This gave him the right to consider himself a "Finnish expert". Finnish?

But why worry about this expert? In the final analysis, it is not he that matters. UPI obviously wanted so much to confuse the issue, to force its readers to doubt the sincerity of the steps being taken by the Soviet Union, that it would use any other pretext that was offered.

Moscow on Nuclear-Free Zone

LD142326 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Viktor Levin Commentary]

[Text] The people of northern countries are welcoming additional steps by the Soviet Union directed at strengthening stability in the region of northern Europe. Comrade Ligachev, who is in Helsinki at the moment, announced these measures. Here is a commentary on the latest news -- Viktor Levin is at the microphone:

Actions recently undertaken by the Soviet Union promote stability in northern Europe and create broad prospects for establishing a nuclear-free zone in this region. This idea has already been on the agenda for a good 30 years, and the Soviet Union has always stressed its favorable attitude toward it. It has been noted many times that the USSR is not only sympathetic to the idea of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe but is also ready to assist its establishment. In particular, our country has expressed its readiness to pledge to respect the status of such a zone and to consider the question of several very substantial measures with regard to its own territory adjacent to the zone -- measures which would strengthen the zone's nuclear-free status.

Now, not only are concrete terms being set out, the implementation of highly important measures has also been announced.

As Comrade Ligachev reported, the Soviet Union has already dismantled the medium-range missile launchers on the Kola Peninsula and a large proportion of the launchers on the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic military districts and relocated a few divisions of operational tactical missiles from these districts. In addition, in the event the Baltic Sea is given nuclear-free status, the USSR will withdraw from its Baltic fleet the submarines which are equipped with ballistic missiles. Within the framework of strengthening the measures of confidence in northern Europe and the waters of the seas adjacent to it, the Soviet Union proposes to start placing restrictions on the intensity of major miliary exercises in this area. As to confidence-building measures in the naval sphere, the Soviet Union also shares the idea of using the positive experience of the Soviet-American agreement on preventing incidents on the open sea and in the airspace above it. These are four concrete ideas; one of them is being put into action at present -- I mean the one that involves dismantling missile launchers -- while the other three are quite concrete and can be implemented by the Soviet Union without hesitation as soon as the other states support them.

Thus the Soviet Union once again vividly demonstrates the characteristics of its foreign policy: effectiveness, constructiveness, and dynamism. Not only do we talk about our adherence to the cause of peace and put forward bold, far-reaching proposals, such as the plan for nuclear arms liquidation, which are of an enormous mobilizing importance, but we also carry out practical actions. Let us recall the moratorium on nuclear explosions and the dismantling of the missile launchers on the Kola Peninsula. By taking these practical actions we are as of this moment getting nearer to the solution of the most acute problem facing mankind.

Gorbachev Book Ceremony Held

LD172202 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Helsinki November 17 TASS -- Today the Soviet Embassy in Finland invited representatives of the Finnish public for a ceremony of launching a collection of speeches and articles by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which was put out here.

The collection brought out under the title "Time of Changes" in the Finnish language by the Weilin Goeoes publishing house [name as received]; includes the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress, which was delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev at the congress, Gorvachev's press conference in Geneva on November 21, 1985 and other materials.

The book contains a preface by Mikhail Gorbachev addressed to the Finnish readership.

Today the executives of the publishing house presented a copy of the collection "Time of Changes" to Finnish President Mauno Koivisto.

REPORTAGE ON VISIT OF GERMAN GREENS DELEGATION

Received by Shevardnadze

PM141136 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

["In A Spirit of Mutual Respect" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, on 12 November received a delegation from the leadership of the Green Party (Federal Republic of Germany) consisting of L. Bechmann, J. Ditfurth, A. Borgmann, N. Kostede, and O. Schily.

The sides held a thorough conversation on key problems of ensuring peace and disarmament in the light of the results of the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik and on issues included in the agenda of the all-European forum in Vienna.

The Soviet side expressed the hope that all political forces opposed to war and committed to human survival would resolutely press in the current difficult international situation for curbing the arms race and establishing relations of trust and goodneighborliness among states with different socio-political systems.

The leaders of the Green Party voiced their support for the Soviet Union's programme for establishing a nuclear-free world, and expressed their own views on a number of aspects related to European affairs.

They denounced plans to militarize outer space, and came out in favor of ridding Europe of nuclear and chemical weapons.

Several issues related to the present state of the Soviet-West German relations were discussed during the conversation.

The meeting was held in the spirit of mutual respect and frankness [otkrovennost].

Talks With Gromyko

PM171049 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 86 Morning Edition page 1

["Meeting With the 'Greens' Party Leadership" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS -- Soon after the end of the war, as far back as in 1946, the USSR suggested in the United Nations organization that nuclear weapons be banned once and for all and that nuclear energy be used only for peaceful purposes. However, at that time the Soviet Union was the only one of the great powers to vote for this proposal.

This fact, showing when and who started the struggle for nuclear disarmament, was cited by Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in a conversation with representatives of the Green Party of West Germany. [paragraph continues]

He received in the Kremlin today a delegation of the Greens' Bundestag leadership who are staying in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. The delegation is led by Anne-Marie Borgmann, co-chairman of the Greens' group in the Bundestag.

During the conversation the sides discussed topical international problems in the setting of the results of the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik and questions connected with Soviet-West German relations.

Andrey Gromyko emphasized that Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central committee, had set forth the stand of the Soviet side at the Reykjavik meeting in a frank and convincing manner. It included history-making proposals, The stand of the Soviet side set forth at the meeting took into account the interests of both countries, of their allies, of all the countries and peoples of the world. The Soviet viewpoint was the concrete expression of a new thinking the need for which is being dictated by the realities of the nuclear-missile age.

Seeking to reach agreements, the Soviet Union put forward proposals which, if accepted, would ensure a possibility of reducing and later on fully scrapping nuclear weapons.

However, the accord that was practically achieved on those Soviet proposals failed to be translated into final agreements, because the American side did not wish to create conditions for their realization. It insisted on the notorious Star Wars plan -- the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, and adopted the stand of eroding the antiballistic missile agreement.

And still, Andrey Gromyko continued, even today possibilities continue to exist for reaching agreement. With this in view it is necessary to start from the level reached in Reykjavik on the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. It is this level that was used as a starting point for the Soviet proposals that were put on the negotiating table in Geneva.

The Soviet side pointed out that the FRG Government had unfortunately supported the stand of Washington which had blocked the advance towards the agreement.

On behalf of the Green Party its leadership welcomed the decision of the Soviet Government to prolong for the fourth term the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. In this connection the need was emphasized for the U.S. to join this step taken by the Soviet Union for the sake of reaching agreement on the discontinuation of all the nuclear explosions.

The delegation of the Green Party said that, of course, the governments of West Germany and other West European countries could, if they wished, promote by their actions the attaining of this goal.

In conclusion, the head of the delegation said that it had beome more clear to the Greens on which questions they maintained common views with the Soviet Union. She expressed gratitude for the frank conversation.

The meeting was attended by L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation; V.V. Tereshkova, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women; and V.G. Vysotin and R.B. Eldarova, chiefs of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium departments.

DPA Version of Talks

LD131852 Hamburg DPA in German 1723 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (DPA) The Greens delegation has described its talks in Moscow so far as "very open and direct." The press spokesman for the Greens, Franz Staenner, told DPA that the impression to date was that the Soviet partners in the talks had been extraordinarily interested in the Green Party and also in the peace movement in the Federal Republic.

At the same time, there have also been clear differences of opinion on disarmament and human rights questions. The six-man delegation from the Bundestag group and the national party executive held more than 7 hours of talks on 12 November with President Andrey Gromyko and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Today, talks with the Soviet minister for nuclear energy are on the agenda.

On disarmament questions, the Soviet side continued to insist on its package solution put forward in Reykjavik, it was reported. However, the Greens stressed that partial solutions must also be possible and could signal the start of an overall disarmament process. In addition, the delegation touched on human rights violations in the Soviet Union and called for the release of all political prisoners. The group also asked to be allowed to visit the Soviet civil rights campaigner Andrey Sakharov.

A further talk on Friday is planned with Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Dobrynin. The talk will center on disarmament issues. It is now unlikely that there will be a talk with party leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Greens delegation includes Lukas Beckmann, Jutta Ditfurth, and Nobert Kosteded from the National Executive, parliamentary party spokeswoman Annemarie Borgmann, and former Bundestag member Otto Schily.

Dobrynin Receives Delegation

LD141558 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1513 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS) -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vadim Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, today received a delegation from the Green Party (FRG) in the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation is in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

A wide range of questions was examined, in particular the struggle against the arms race, for disarmament, and ecological and humanitarian problems. The representatives of both parties noted a significant coincidence in their positions on the central question of modern times — the prevention of nuclear war and the achievement of lasting peace.

The desire was expressed on both sides to strengthen peace and confidence in Europe, and this includes expressing support for ideas aimed at doing away with nuclear and chemical weapons and at reducing conventional arms in central Europe.

The difference existing between the CPSU and the "Greens" on some questions should not impede joint or parallel actions in this direction.

Both sides expressed the desire to develop cooperation between the CPSU and the "Greens" in the interests of strengthening peace, and in this connection they reached agreement on a number of specific steps.

Greens Hold Press Conference

LD141610 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- We are deeply convinced that the far-reaching Soviet disarmament proposals are of history-making significance. A statement to this effect has been made today by Lukas Beckmann, one of the leaders of the Green party (FRG). He was addressing here a press conference for Soviet and foreign newsmen given today by the delegation of that party's floor leaders in the FRG Bundestag.

Lukas Beckmann stressed that the members of the delegation highly appreciate the preparedness of the Soviet side to draw the European nations into the disarmament dialogue on an even broader scale.

Otto Schily, member of the delegation, pointed out the highly negative attitude of the "Greens" to the American "Star Wars" programme. We feel that it is not of a defensive, but an offensive, aggressive character, he said. The so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" is rejected in the FRG also by the social democrats, trade unions and representatives of religious circles. Deplorably, the country's government practically misses no opportunity to express its support for that programme. We resolutely condemn this policy.

Evaluating the meetings and conversations held in Moscow. The members of the delegation pointed out their frank and well-wishing character. They declared for broadening contacts between the Green Party and the CPSU, and pointed out that despite the distinctions in views, such contacts are useful for a mutual clarification of the stands.

DPA Version of Conference

LD141742 Hamburg DPA in German 1510 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (DPA) -- Both Soviet head of state Andrey Gromyko and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze again mentioned in the talks with representatives of the Greens in Moscow Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl's controversial remarks in an interview. Shevardnadze said that Kohl's remarks were "an insult to every Soviet family," Greens member Otto Schily said at a press conference in Moscow today. Both politicians have pointed with great seriousness to the chancellor's comparison between Mikhail Gorbachev and Nazi propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels.

According to Greens spokesman Lukas Beckmann the Greens made clear their appreciation of the Soviet disarmament proposals. At the same time, however, they also spoke against the linkage between agreement on disarmament and limitations on the United States SDI project tabled by the USSR at the Reykjavik summit. In this question there were differences of opinion in the analysis and the practical implementation.

With regard to human rights in the USSR the group stressed what they saw as a direct connection existing between internal democracy and peace toward the external world. A visit to Soviet dissident Andrey Sakharaov was refused, Beckman said. In a letter to party leader Mikhail Gorbachev the delegation asked for the release of 18 political prisoners in the USSR.

Greens spokesman Jutta Ditfurth described her talks with Soviet nuclear experts as "controversial and unpleasant." The Soviet side expressed its known position of a stepped-up expansion of nuclear energy. The Chernobyl nuclear accident was attributed solely to human error. The Soviets said that measures have been taken against an existing residual risk of another accident. Furthermore, the delegation submitted documents from which, according to Frau Ditfurth, it emerged that the USSR obtained uranium from Namibia, contrary to United Nations regulations on this matter. The Soviets with whom they talked rejected this, but stated that uranium from that country could possibly reach the USSR with incorrect labels.

The six delegates from the federal party executive and the Bundestag group of the Greens concluded their 3-day visit to the USSR on Friday.

JOINT FRG ECONOMIC COMMISSION ENDS WORK IN MOSCOW

LD051501 Hamburg DPA in German 1010 GMT 5 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 5 Nov (DPA) -- The two chairmen of the German-Soviet Economic Commission, Federal Economics minister Martin Bangemann and Soviet Deputy Premier Aleksey Antonov, may still meet for talks this year. It was said in well-informed circles in Moscow that at the working session of the commission which ended on Tuesday a meeting by the end of the year was being considered.

The venue for the talks had not yet been determined. It will, however, probably be Bonn since under present practice, an interim meeting always takes place at the venue of the next commission session. This was being planned for next spring in Bonn.

At the talks in Moscow on Tuesday, which were led by Lorenz Schomerus, head of department in the Federal Economics Ministry, and Deputy Foreign Trade Minister Vladislav Malkevich, the development of bilateral economic and scientific-technical relations since the last meeting in April were discussed. The program for cooperation for the coming half-year was also discussed. An important topic was "new forms of economic cooperation", including joint ventures.

The German delegation left Moscow on Tuesday evening. The talks between experts of the USSR and FRG evidently passed off in a businesslike and routine manner. The visits by Research Minister Heinz Riesenhuber and the head of foreign cultural policy, Barthold Witte, to Moscow have been cancelled at short notice due to remarks by Federal Chancellor Kohl on Gorbachev and Goebbels.

REPORT ON THATCHER PRESS CONFERENCE, REAGAN TALKS

LD161755 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] At his country residence at Camp David, President Reagan has had talks with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain. At a press conference after the talks the head of the British Government stated that, in the view of Washington and London, in the situation that has taken shape after the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik, the priority tasks are to reach agreement on medium-range missiles, to reduce U.S. and Soviet strategic weapons by 50 percent in the next 5 years, and to ban chemical weapons.

At the same time, the same statement was read out to journalists in the White House by a high-ranking representative of the administration. While backing up in words the aim of reaching agreement on arms control, the Republican administration and the Tory Government are in fact seeking to depart from the positions agreed in Iceland. During the press conference Thatcher once again affirmed her government's support for the U.S. Star Wars program. At the same time, as the Washington correspondent of the British SUNDAY TIMES points out, during the talks Thatcher insistently called upon the United States to adhere to the provisions of the SALT II treaty.

BRIEFS

USSR AMBASSADOR TO IRELAND -- Moscow November 12 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Gennadiy Uranov as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to Ireland. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has relieved Alexey Nesterenko of the duties of the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to Ireland in view of his retirement. Gennadiy Uranov was born in 1934. In 1978-82 -- he was ambassador of the USSR to the Gabonese Republic and from 1982 -- he was deputy chairman, executive secretary of the USSR UNESCO Commission. Uranov is a member of the UNESCO Executive Council. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 12 Nov 86 LD]

GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON NICARAGUA POLICY

PM180957 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 1

["Soviet Government Statement" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] The development of events in Central America is assuming an increasingly dangerous character. The U.S. Administration, flagrantly violating the elementary norms of international law and the principles of the U.N. Charter, is stepping up overt interference in the affairs of Nicaragua. In so doing they in Washington do not conceal that they are aiming at overthrowing the legitimate government of that sovereign, independent country.

The President of the United States has signed a law on funding the hired counterrevolutionary bands and on supplying them with various types of weapons.

Moreover, provision is made in point of fact for a direct participation of U.S. military personnel in the counterrevolutionaries' actions. U.S. propaganda is busy intensively manipulating U.S. and international public opinion for the purpose of bringing about an appropriate atmosphere for the realization of plans for direct military actions against Nicaragua.

Such U.S. line constitutes an undisguised challenge to international law and order. The U.S. Administration did not reckon with the ruling of the international court which demanded an end to encroachments upon the sovereignty and independence of Nicaragua.

The U.S. Administration ignores the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council and the General Assembly, and the explicit stand of the Nonaligned Movement.

Neither is the U.S. Administration willing to listen to the opinion of its Latin American neighbors. Their constructive efforts to achieve a mutually acceptable political settlement in Central America within the framework of the Contadora process are systematically torpedoed by Washington.

Thereby Washington's great-power claims to managing affairs in Latin American countries as it sees fit -- disregarding the will of their peoples and governments and their striving to decide their future themselves, proceeding from their own traditions, convictions, and notions of the worthiest way of life -- are being laid bare more and more vividly.

The international community's legitimate concern over the current explosive situation in Central America and over its possible consequences to international peace is shared in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government firmly condemns the escalation of the U.S. aggressive policy in Central America, is demanding that an end be put to criminal preparations spearheaded against the Nicaraguan people and is calling on the United States to show restraint, realism, and responsibility.

The Soviet Union solidarizes with the conviction expressed in the declaration dated October 1, this year, by the ministers of foreign affairs of the Contadora Group and the support group that peace in Central America is possible.

The attainment of peace requires, first of all, an end to interference in the affairs of the sovereign countries of the region, respect in practice for their right to an independent choice, the establishment of good-neighborly relations and cooperation between them, and the rendering of assistance to them in solving urgent socio-economic problems.

The USSR supports the constructive goals of the Contadora process which is aimed at achieving a Latin American solution to the regional crisis, and is ready practically to promote the creation of favorable conditions for a just political settlement in Central America.

The U.S. Administration tries to justify its interventionist actions with regard to Nicaragua by pleading an 'increase in Soviet military presence' in that country.

The Soviet Government resolutely rejects such assertions as totally unfounded. It states in all responsibility that the USSR did not and does not set up any military bases whatsoever in Nicaragua.

The Soviet Union is again reaffirming its firm solidarity with the just cause of the people of Nicaragua and its readiness to continue to render assistance and support to it in the struggle for freedom and independence.

U.S. POLICY CITED 'MAIN DEFENDANT" IN TRIAL

LD161343 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0740 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 16 Nov (TASS) -- TASS commentator Yuriy Aleksandrov writes:

Eugene Hasenfus, a U.S. military adviser, who on the instructions of the CIA delivered weapons to Nicaraguan Contras on an "S-123" transport plane, has incurred deserved punishment: for participation in the armed struggle against sovereign Nicaragua he has been sentenced to 30 years' deprivation of freedom. However the main defendant at the trial in Managua was not he but Washington's aggressive policy in Central America.

The anti-Somoza people's tribunal, in having carefully considered all the material connected with Eugene Hasenfus' crime against Nicaragua, showed most obviously that the U.S. Administration, carefully masing its activities and using the CIA, is delivering weapons, ammunition and other military equipment to bands of Somozist mercenaries who have entrenched themselves in southern Nicaragua. The transfer of weapons for the Contras by air has become a habitual practice for the enemies of the Sandinista Revolution. Transport planes with weapons on board fly routinely from Ilopango to Salvador, from Aguacate to Honduras, and from other CIA military bases.

For a long time the United States has been waging an "undeclared war" against sovereign Nicaragua. It is trying in every way to suppress the Sandinista revolution: it introduces economic sanctions, sets up a trade blockade, gives multi-million dollar aid to the counterrevolution and carries out military maneuvers in the direct vicinity of Nicaragua's borders. In a word, the United States is carrying out a policy of state terrorism with regard to a small sovereign country whose course for the protection of national and democratic interests does not suit it. However the intrigues of U.S. imperialism shatter against the will of the revolutionary people, united around the Sandinista leadership and ready to give a rebuff to any intrigues of world reaction.

CPSU CC MESSAGE TO ARGENTINE CP CONGRESS

PM071251 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Nov 86 First Edition p 2

[CPSU Central Committee message to 16th Communist Party of Argentina Congress]

[Text] To the 16th Communist Party of Argentine Congress.
Dear Comrades!
The CPSU Central Committee sends fraternal greetings to the delegates to the 16th Communist Party of Argentina [PCA] Congress and all Argentine Communists.

Your congress is taking place in a complex international situation, when a threat to mankind's very existence can be keenly felt, this threat has been created by the policy of the most aggressive imperialist circles, primarily North American, and their course aimed at further whipping up the nuclear arms race, increasing international tension, and interfering in the internal affairs of other states.

To avert this looming danger is the aim of the CPSU policy worked out by its 27th congress. Putting this policy into practice, the Soviet Union put forward proposals at the Reykjavik meeting which open up the possibility of beginning to move in the direction of a nuclear-free world. The results of this meeting are a signal to peoples, social and political organizations, and governments to urgently step up their efforts in favor of disarmament and detente.

An increasingly active role in the struggle for peace is being played by the broad public and many governments in Latin American countries, rightly linking an end to the arms race and an improvement in the international situation with the solution of such vital problems as economic backwardness and foreign debt. A prominent place in this respect is held by Argentina, which is an active member of the "Delhi Six," making a constructive contribution to the search for ways to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The growing determination of Latin American countries to pursue an active, independent policy is also apparent in their demonstrations against imperialist pressure and interference and their disagreement with U.S. interventionist actions against Nicaragua and the threats addressed to Cuba. Latin America's growing role in the world arena is regarded with satisfaction by the Soviet Union.

The assumption of power by a civlian government in place of the military dictatorship and the restoration of the constitutional procedures which are a major achievement of the Argentine people acted as an important impetus for Soviet-Argentine relations. The recent top-level talks between the USSR and Argentine leaders confirmed that there are favorable prospects for equal, mutually advantageous bilateral cooperation.

Our parties are linked by traditional comradely ties that have withstood the test of time. They are founded on our common loyalty to socialist ideals and to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Soviet Communists know the PCA to be a party which has raised aloft the banner of defense of the working people's interests, consistently upholds the cause of peace on earth and invariably shows solidarity with other peoples' liberation struggle, a party which has always been an advocate of friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

We wish your congress successful work.
Long live the friendship between the CPSU and the PCA and between the Soviet and Argentine peoples!
The CPSU Central Committee.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON SUPREME SOVIET SESSION

TASS Report

LD171619 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet (Parliament) opened today in Moscow. The first item on its agenda is the draft plan of the country's economic and social development for 1987 and the draft budget of the country for 1987.

Delivering the reports, the chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee Nikolay Talyzin and the USSR finance minister Boris Gostev stated that the USSR's national income is planned to be increased by over four per cent next year.

Three quarters of the growth of the national income is planned to be channelled for raising the people's prosperity. Among the measures planned is the increase of the wages, the widening of the sphere of services. A greater volume of housing than it has been planned earlier will be built.

(Flats are provided for the population in the USSR free of charge, with the rent making up on an average 3-5 per cent of a family's budget).

The share of allocations for defence for 1987 remains at the level of the current year.

The discussion of the draft plan and the draft budget was started in the afternoon by the deputies to the parliament at separate sittings of the two chambers -- the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities.

A joint meeting of the Commissions for Foreign Affairs of both chambers was also held today. In connection with the situation that is shaping after the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik, they have decided to suggest the adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of the address "to the parliaments and peoples of the world."

The session will continue on Tuesday.

Marchuk Address

LD171241 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- "The Soviet Academy of Sciences regards the state plan for the economic and social development of the U.S.S.R. for 1987 from the point of view of prospects for accelerating the country's social and economic development," said Guriy Marchuk, president of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. He was speaking at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. that opened in the Kremlin today.

The scientist devoted special attention to the development of scientific research and application of its discoveries.

"The draft plan," he went on to say, "has a number of assignments dealing with the introduction of fundamentally new generations of equipment, materials and technologies. Approximately 300 major completed works by academic scientific establishments and 400 development projects carried out by research institutes would be put to use on the basis of direct ties with different sectors of the National economy."

"Next year," the speaker emphasized, "may well be described as the year of machine building. The pace of growth of machine building will overtake the overall growth of industrial production. It is planned to increase even faster the output in leading branches of machine building, notably in machine-tool manufacture, instrument making, electrical engineering and electronics.

"The plan sets before the machine building ministries alone the task of increasing the share of equipment corresponding to world standards by 60 percent in 1987. This is a very challenging task, but it can be accomplished," Marchuk said.

"Further development of cooperation with the CMEA (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) countries will promote the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and help production achieve leading positions in science and technology. This effort is made on the basis of the comprehensive program for scientific and technological progress of the CMEA countries for the period till the year 2000. About 1,400 research, development and design institutions and establishments of the U.S.S.R. are involved in its implementation," Academician Marchuk said.

Foreign Affairs Commissions Meet

LD171336 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] A joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet foreign affairs commission of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities was held in the Kremlin today. Ligachev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Foreign Affairs Commission, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Dobrynin, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commission, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the work of the session. The session was also attended by Tolkunov and Voss, representatives of the Supreme Soviet chambers, and by Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The session was chaired by Comrade Ligachev. Following an exchange of views the commissions decided to put forward the initiative for the USSR Supreme Soviet to adopt an address to parliaments and peoples of the world in connection with the situation prevailing after the top-level Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik.

Postsummit Message Proposed

LD171233 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- The Foreign Relations Commission of both chambers of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. decided to propose that the Supreme Soviet adopt a message "To the parliaments and peoples of the world" in conjunction with the situation taking shape after the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik.

Evening Session

LD172224 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast: video report]

[Text] In the evening, the first session of the Soviet of Nationalities was held in the sessions hall of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A report of the Mandate Commission on checking the authorization of the newly elected deputies was delivered by Deputy Miroshkin, the chairman of the commission. A corresponding decision was adopted.

A report of the standing commissions, on the State Plan and Budget for 1987, was delivered by Deputy Maslennikov, chairman of the Planning and Budget Commission of the chamber.

Then the debate on the reports began. The following spoke in the debate: Deputy Sokolov, first secretary of the Brest Obkom of the Belorussian Communist Party; Deputy Kazakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Deputy Zharko, a female worker of the Lvov Television works of the Elektron Production Association; Deputy Chirskov; USSR minister of construction of oil and gas industry enterprises; Deputy Grebenyuk, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR; Deputy Karpov, first secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union; Deputy Mikuchyauskas, first secretary of the Vilnius Gorkom of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work 18 November. [video shows all listed speakers]

Second Day's Work

LD180605 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0304 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpt] Today is the second day of work of session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The deputies will continue discussion of drafts of the plan for the country's social and economic development, and of its budget for 1987. This discussion will be held in separate sessions of the chambers. The Soviet of Nationalities will assemble for its meeting at 1000 in the morning, and the Soviet of the Union at 1500." [passage omitted]

Deputies Debate Budget

LD172127 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1406 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov -- TASS special correspondents report from the Kremlin:

In the USSR's draft plan for 1987 questions of social development occupy a greater place than ever before. For the first time a comprehensive social section has been fully elaborated in it which embraces all aspects of the problem. It is to this that the deputies are turning their attention when they speak from the rostrum at the USSR Supreme Soviet. At the session that began today in the Kremlin, discussion is going on on the country's draft plan and budget for the coming year.

Note was made of the increase in the social gains in the RSFSR economy in a speech by Deputy Fikryat Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. He said that the plan for next year envisions the construction, in this the largest republic of the USSR, of more than a million apartments. This exceeds the figures projected in the 5-year plan (1986-1990). Also higher than these are certain figures in the RSFSR's social plan for next year.

Deputy Lyudmila Shurygina (Moscow) spoke about the program for the capital's social development for next year. Fifty thousand apartments, 230 new shops, cafes, and canteens, 55 children's homes, 13 large polyclinics, and many other buildings will be built in the city. A doctor by profession, she criticized the city authorities for formalism in managing health care. The deputy stressed the need to make a radical improvement in the situation at construciton sites for health care institutions.

Deputy Vladimir Klyuyev, USSR minister of light industry, acknowledged the justice of consumers' reproaches and complaints against the industry. It is not that the industry has started working less well, the minister asserted. Outdated enterprises are simply unable to satisfy increased demand. He said that now, when due attention is being given to light industry, a turn around in its work has been targeted.

We are not content with what has been achieved in resolving the social program, even though we are indeed proud of what has been done, said deputy Kyamran Bagirov, leader of Azerbaijan (Transcaucasus) Communists. The republic is building many housing blocks, social amenities, and cultural facilities -- the 1987 plan indicates this. However, there are problems that are not being resolved well -- for instance, the service sphere is poor in our republic.

The state of affairs where only remnants of resources were allocated to social needs has been overcome in the Ukraine, Deputy Aleksandr Lyashko said. Now the situation has changed. Social development in the Ukraine is forging ahead at an unprecedented speed. This is reflected in the indices of the plan for 1987, which we consider good and propose should be ratified.

TV Reports Proceedings

LD172222 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report]

[Text] At 1400, in the sessions hall of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the first session of the Soviet of the Union began. On the report by Deputy Demirchyan, chairman of the Mandate Commission of the chamber, a decision was unanimously adopted on recognizing the authority of the newly elected deputies. Deputy Masol, chairman of the Planning and Budget Commission, presented a report of the standing commissions of the Soviet of the Union, on the Country's State Plan and Budget for 1987.

Then the deputies began discussion of the drafts of the country's state plan and budget. Taking part in the debates were Deputy Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Deputy Lyashko, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR; Deputy Bagirov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan; Deputy Shurgina, head of a department of Moscow City Polyclinic No 79; Deputy Klyuyev, USSR minister of the light industry; and Deputy Alimov, first secretary of the Tashkent Obkom of the Uzbek Communist Party. [video shows shots of all speakers speaking from rostrum]

Power Ministry Criticized

LD181109 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- A special TASS correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The further development of power engineering is among the major problems being discussed by the deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (Soviet Parliament) at its current session which opened here on Monday. The session is continuing today a debate on the draft plan and the draft budget of the USSR for 1987.

The attention given to power production is quite understandable. The present year was not an easy one for this industry because of a drop in "atomic" power production as a result of the Chernobyl accident. The hydropower stations in Central Asia have generated less electricity because of reduced flow of its rivers. And yet, as Nikolay Talyzin, chairman of the State Planning Committee, said in his report yesterday, the annual plan, and not a small one, for power production -- 1 trillion 605 billion kilowatt hours -- will be carried out thanks to the thermal power stations which have taken up themselves a great load.

As is shown by the draft plan, enhanced assignments for thermal power stations will continue into 1987. Therefore speakers in the debate pointed to the need for raising the efficiency of thermal power stations. Such stations burn too much fuel. True, the average figure of excessive fuel consumption is only 2.4 grams per each kilowatt hour of electricity. But on a national scale it amounts to a loss of 2.5 million tons of coal, or five hundred trainloads. The reasons for this are many and varied -- obsolete equipment, inefficient technology or simply poor discipline of people. Gennadiy Kisilev, deputy from Kirghizia, blames this on the Ministry of Power Engineering.

Other speakers believe that the ministry, while laying emphasis on the construction of power stations, sometimes forgets about power transmission lines. There is a water shortage in Central Asia now while there is plenty of water in Siberian rivers and Siberian hydropower stations have considerable reserve capacities. But these reserves cannot be put to use in order to help Central Asia because there are few power transmission lines there.

The deputies are very sharp in their criticisms. They suggest ways of ensuring the fulfilment of next year's plan which is 60 billion kilowatt hours bigger than the present one. It is important not just to carry it out at any price but also to do so with the greatest economic effect.

Soviet of Nationalities Session

LD180735 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] At this moment in the Kremlin the 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is resuming work. The sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities is beginning. The Soviet of the Union will gather at 1500 [1200 GMT]. The deputies will continue the discussion of the draft plan for the socioeconomic development of the country and its budget for 1987 that began yesterday.

In the opinion of deputies who made speeches on the day of the opening of the session both the plan and the budget are directed at a harmonious development of all republics in the unified national economy complex, and answer the interests of the people. In the debates it was stressed that the full use of the possibilities of the new economic mechanism, emphasis on the human factor, and enhancement of interest and initiative are required for the fulfilling of the plan.

Voss Chairs Opening

LD180820 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] The second session of the Soviet of Nationalities opened at 1000 today in the sessions hall of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Deputies and guests greeted with applause Comrades Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Sokolov, Biryukova, Dobrynin and Nikonov. The session is being chaired by Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities.

Socioeconomic Debate Continues

LD181106 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing its work in the Kremlin today. The second session of the Soviet of Nationalities began 2 hours ago. Deputies and guests greeted with applause Comrades Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Sokolov, Biryukova, Dobrynin and Nikonov. The deputies continued to discuss the draft plan of the socioeconomic development of the country and its budget for the 2d year of the 5-year plan period. Speakers in the debate on this question, the first on the agenda of this session, were Comrades Nazirov, an operator of the Nefteorgsintez production association of Ferghana in Uzbekistan; (Berdzinishvili), a sculptor from Georgia; Mamedova, a teacher from Azerbaijan; Busygin, USSR minister of the timber, pulp and paper and wood processing industry; Kiselev, second secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia Central Committee; and other deputies. Proposing the acceptance of the program of the socioeconomic development of the country for 1987, they emphasized that this program provides for a harmonious combination of principles based on territories and branches of industry in the development of the economy and a growth of the contribution of the republics, krays and oblasts in consolidating the united national-economic complex of the country. The debate in the Soviet of Nationalities will continue until 1400. At 1500 the discussion of the country's plan and budget for next year will be renewed in the other chamber of the USSR Supreme Soviet -- the Soviet of the Union.

IZVESTIYA ON SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM SESSION

PM180859 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Session"]

[Text] A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chaired by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, was held in the Kremlin 14 November.

Questions concerning the holding of the 6th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, were examined.

Proposals on the agenda and order of work for the session of the country's supreme organ of state power were discussed and approved.

There was scrutiny of the question of the completion of work by the Plan and Budget Commissions and other permanent commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers on the preliminary examination of the State Plan for Economic and Social Development in 1987 and the progress of plan fulfillment in 1986, the USSR State Budget for 1987, and the report on budget implementation in 1985. N.I. Maslennikov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Plan and Budget Commission, delivered a report on instructions from the permanent commissions of the chambers.

There was an examination of a report by the Legislative Proposals Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers on the completion of work on the preliminary examination of materials on the report on the activity of the USSR People's Control Committee. V.P. Mironov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Legislative Proposals Commission, spoke on this question at the session.

A report from the Legislative Proposals Commissions on the draft USSR Law on Individual Labor Activity was also heard; it was delivered by A.A. Titarenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Legislative Proposals Commission. It was resolved to submit this draft law for examination by the Sixth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The session discussed the question of submitting Presidium decrees adopted in the period between the Fifth and Sixth Sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet for approval by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The presidium examined the question of the ratification of the Convention on Prompt Notification of Nuclear Accidents and the convention on Assistance in the Event of a Nuclear Accident or Emergency Radiation Situation, signed in Vienna 26 September 1986.

On instructions from the USSR Government, which submitted these conventions for ratification, a report was read by B. Ye Shcherbina, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The following took part in the debate: V.S. Shevchenko, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; G.S. Tarazevich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; R.-B.I. Songayla, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister; and L.M. Voronin, USSR deputy minister of nuclear power industry.

The report and the speeches by participants in the session described in detail the conventions and their importance for the development of cooperation between states in such a vitally important and promising sphere as the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy.

Attention was drawn to the fact that, in the course of the elaboration of the conventions, the Soviet side acted purposefully and flexibly, taking into account the positions and concerns of other countries. The readiness the Soviet Union expressed during the talks to notify all cases of nuclear accidents, including accidents at military installations, involving nuclear weapons, and in the course of nuclear tests, was recently confirmed by specific actions in the spirit of the Convention on Prompt Notification.

The conclusion of these agreements is also essential for the establishment of confidence, and vividly confirms the real opportunity for reaching agreements affecting safety questions. The Soviet Union believes that the steps taken in the IAEA, including the elaboration of the conventions in question, constitute an important landmark along the path toward ensuring the reliability of nuclear energy on an international scale.

It was noted that it is necessary to enhance the role of the IAEA and also of the United Nations and its specialized institutions like the WHO, UNESCO, and the Environment Program, in the work to ensure the stable and safe utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Summing up the results of the exchange of opinions which had taken place, A.A. Gromyko emphasized in particular the broad support encountered in the world by the proposals, put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the creation of an international system for the safe development of the nuclear power industry on the basis of close cooperation between all countries engaged in the nuclear power industry. The fundamental elements of such a system were indeed elaborated at the special session of the IAEA General Conference held in September. We are grateful to all countries and international organizations which took part in it for the efforts they made. The preparation of two international conventions by the IAEA within such a brief period offers a convincing example that states can jointly seek and find solutions to complex problems in which politics and economics and the scientific, technical, and humanitarian aspects are often intertwined. The Soviet Union will continue to do everything within its power to implement the program, put forward by us, for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. The system for the safe development of the nuclear power industry also can and must become a weighty contribution to the cause of ensuring universal security.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium unanimously ratified the Convention on Prompt Notification of Nuclear Accidents and the Convention on Assistance in the Event of a Nuclear Accident or Emergency Radiation Situation.

Comrades. D.A. Kunayev, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, P.N. Demichev, B.N. Yeltsin, N.N. Slyunkov, and Yu.F. Solovyev took part in the discussion of questions on the agenda.

Nuclear Convention Decree

PM171429 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree on the Ratification of the Convention on Prompt Notification of Nuclear Accidents and the Convention on Assistance in the Event of Nuclear Accident or Emergency Radiation Situation"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees:

The Convention on Prompt Notification of Nuclear Accidents and the Convention on Assistance in the Event of Nuclear Accident or Emergency Radiation Situation, signed on behalf of the USSR in Vienna 26 September 1986 and submitted by the USSR Council of Ministers for ratification, are hereby ratified subject to the following reservation:

"The USSR will not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 11 (Paragraph 2) of the Convention on Prompt Warning of Nuclear Accidents and by Article 13 (Paragraph 2) of the Convention on Assistance in the Event of Nuclear Accident or Emergency Radiation Situation, which make provision for the submission of a dispute between participating states to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice at any side's request, and declares that consent by all sides is necessary in every individual case for the submission of any international dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
T. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Moscow, the Kremlin, 14 November 1986

CPSU'S YELTSIN INTERVIEWED ON RESTRUCTURING

AU131227 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 1 Nov 86 p 6

[Interview given by Boris Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee, to the NOVOSTI news agency, Prague RUDE PRAVO, and Bratislava PRAVDA: "About Restructuring Under the Conditions of Moscow" -- place and date of interview not specified; first paragraph is newspaper's introduction]

[Text] Comrade Boris Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee, gave an interview to NOVOSTI, RUDE PRAVDO, and PRAVDA in which he discussed current problems concerning the restructuring of Soviet society under the specific conditions of the Soviet capital and the exacting tasks of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development as mapped out by the CPSU Central Committee session of last April and further elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress.

[Question] Which problems in the life of the Soviet capital in the years of the 12th 5-Year Plan do you consider to be of the greatest importance and relevance? What measures have been adopted for their accelerated solution?

[Yeltsin] I would say that the 12th 5-Year Plan is characterized by the special atmosphere of this period. At the 27th CPSU Congress Soviet communists spoke in a frank and principled fashion about urgent problems. The congress adopted strategic decisions of key importance aimed at bringing about profound economic and social transformations in the life of the country. It critically assessed the preceding period in the life of our society and candidly and honestly discussed mistakes and shortcomings. But the main thing was that it mapped out the line of accelerating the socioeconomic development of the country.

All that is happening in our country today is, in our opinion, of tremendous importance for enhancing the strength and cohesion of all states of the socialist community. And, today more than ever before, the dynamism of the economic and social development of the world socialist system influences the fortunes of the world and social progress. The forms of cooperation among CEMA member-countries, aimed at a future in peace, are being developed and filled with new content.

Transforming swords into ploughshares, that is an ancient longing of mankind. Now, at a sharp turning point in the history of civilization on Earth, an exceptional chance has appeared to realize this ancient dream. The road to this has been opened up by the Soviet peace proposals, by the realistic program of liquidating nuclear and chemical weapons on Earth until the year 2000 and of preventing the militarization of space. This program was discussed, inter alia, by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his recent interview for RUDE PRAVO.

The communists of Moscow focus their attention primarily on the solution of the most burning problems in the life of the capital. What are these problems? I must say, first of all, that we are not satisfied with the results of the socioeconomic development of Moscow in the preceding years. The city party committee has drawn attention to great disproportions and shortcomings in the infrastructure of the city.

The tasks of the 5-year plan with respect to the construction of apartments, hospitals, and service facilities remained unfulfilled. The urgent problem of improving the housing conditions of Muscovites and of placing their children in nurseries and kindergartens persists.

Transport, too, remains a big problem. The volume of communications under construction is not increasing. The speed of subway construction does not tally with today's needs. There exist unresolved problems in environmental protection and health care. All of this has had a negative impact on the balanced and proportionate economic, social, and urbanistic development of Moscow. In implementing the strategy of acceleration in the current 5-year plan, the people of Moscow are to increase industrial production 19 percent. This is 1.6 times more than in the preceding 5-year period. Labor productivity in industry is to increase 21.5 percent.

The greatest contribution to accelerating industrial production is to be made by a rapid growth in labor productivity based on a broad application of the results of scientific and technical progress, a fundamental renewal of capital assets, improved organization of technological processes, and on a radical reduction in the share of manual work.

[Question] One of the tasks formulated on the national scale is to devote far greater attention to the reconstruction of existing facilities and to a more rapid renewal of the machine pool....

[Yeltsin] The goal that we have set for Moscow in this respect is to renew every year between 12 and 15 percent of the active part of production assets. By the end of the 5-year plan, the share of manual work should be reduced by a full 20 percent. More than 3,000 fully mechanized, automated, and semiautomated production lines, a formidable number of robot-equipped complexes, and installations equipped with numerical, computerized control of new, economical, and progressive technological processes and mechanical devices will be put into operation. The manpower situation in material production is to be reexamined with the aim of reducing the number of employees. Manpower set free in this way will be transferred to the service sector.

Another important item in our plans is a 25 percent increase in the volume of construction and assembly work. A special place in these kplans is occupied by a comprehensive reconstruction of the center of Moscow and by the completion of its infrastructure.

Fundamental measures also concern the accelerated construction of the transport network. The volume of passenger traffic in the city will increase almost 10 percent. A total of 45 km of subway routes are to be put into operation; by the end of the century, the subway network should reach a length of 360 km. A total of 16.5 million square meters of housing area are to be handed over to their users. The number of schools to be built is 1.4 times higher than in the preceding 5-year plan. The task has been set to comprehensively resolve the problem of nurseries and kindergartens. The volume of investments in health care will increase more than 1.5 fold. More than 2,000 stores, coffee shops, canteens, and other service facilities are to be put into operation. There will be a substantial increase in the volume of services rendered to the population. We also foresee the development of social services within the framework of enterprises.

It was only after considering all possible variants that we approached the drawing up of the plan. We literally struggled for each tenth of a percent of growth. In keeping with the requirement contained in a resolution of the Moscow CPSU City Committee, we uncovered untapped reserves permitting a further 0.5 percent increase in the volume of production and in labor productivity. [paragraph continues]

The set targets are demanding, but on the other hand we regard them as the minimal program. Such are the demands of the June session of our party's Central Committee.

[Question] Which basic problems must be resolved in order to ensure a successful fulfillment of these plans?

[Yeltsin] First of all, we must achieve on a priority basis labor productivity growth in all branches of the city's economy. The tasks of the 5-year plan must be fulfilled and overfulfilled with a smaller number of employees. In the course of the 5-year plan we must make ends meet with the existing manpower potential.

The manpower problem was the subject of a sharp debate also at the 19 July session of the Moscow CPSU City Committee. What is the gist of the problem? Under the conditions of Moscow, a more efficient use of manpower resources is the key issue. The problem has not emerged overnight. In the course of the preceding three 5-year plans, there was an uninterrrupted inflow of manpower to Moscow, which, as is now becoming apparent, is not easy to bring to a halt. In those 15 years, more than 700,000 people came to work in Moscow from other cities.

This was the reason why, toward the end of 1985, the city's population as defined in the general plan for Moscow's development was 1.2 million larger than planned, and the development of the social infrastructure was seriously lagging behind the norm indexes. The size of Moscow's population is the main index in working out the plans. Today we proceed from the estimate that 9.1 million people will be living and working in the capital in 1990; and 9.5 million in the year 2000. If these indexes are adhered to the disproportions that are now evident in the city's infrastructure will be eliminated. First of all one must ensure the efficient use of manpower resources. In approving the regulation on socialist competition between municipal districts in the 12th 5-year period, the bureau of the party's city committee set adherence to the limits for the number of employees in enterprises and organizations in the district as one of the main criteria (of which there are seven). We are convinced that this will enable us to ascertain the exact number of working places required in all spheres in every municipal district, and to charge the party's district committees and executive committees of district soviets with the duty to consistently check on the measures for economizing manpower.

I would also like to mention another important task — namely, ensuring a 12-15 percent annual renewal of the active part of basic assets. By doing this we will be able to step up the volume of new technology introduced in production to a level that is twice, and in certain districts even three times, the level during the past 5-year period. It is also important to improve the degree to which existing equipment is being used; and above all to increase the coefficient of shift intensity. The assessment [atestace] and rationalization of working places is of a fundamental importance.

The executive committee of the Moscow Soviet, the branch departments of the party's city committee, and the CPSU'S district committees and organizations of the Scientific-Technical Society and of the All-Union Society of Inventors, have all been involved in the search for a way to resolve these issues. Every enterprise and all the branches of the city's national economy have been striving to put the sphere of manpower in order since January 1986; they have been rewriting plans for the technical "retooling" of production and adopting measures to accelerate the assessment and rationalization of work places with a view to reducing the number of employees in production by at least 5 percent. One of the most important areas for accelerating scientific-technical progress in industry is the widescale mechanization and automation of production, together with the use of programmed lathes, machinery, and mechanisms, and standardized equipment modules, robotized complexes, and computer technology. [paragraph continues]

This task is of particular importance for Moscow because of the limited possibilities of extensively expanding production by means of new construction projects.

We already have a program for introducing automated systems, and technological complexes using robotized elements and microprocessors, into Moscow's enterprises in the period 1984-90. We are now directing the efforts of many specialists toward accomplishing specific tasks connected withteh introduction of highly efficient means of production automation into most industrial branches.

[Question] In this context, the issue of quality will surely not remain in the background?

[Yeltsin] Of course not. The most important task of party organizations and working collectives in associations and plants in the city is to realize the resolution adopted by the 27th CPSU congress on the radical improvement of technical standards and production quality.

In seeking new forms of organization we finally decided in favor of a program and special purpose [programove-cilovy] method of quality control. One practical outcome of this is the comprehensive city program, known as the Quality Program, drawn up for the 12th 5-year period. Today such programs exist in all enterprises producing the most important kinds of goods. I emphasize: every working collective has to defend its program in front of a commission of experts and in the presence of consumer representatives; and the program is approved only if it provides for an improvement in quality and approaches the best world standards.

Both city and district party committees and the CPSU'S basic organizations should ensure sufficient creative cooperation between branch, academic, and university-level scientific institutions; this should yield rich fruit quite soon. Regrettably, in the 11th 5-year period the time for completing scientific research projects and for realizing them in practice was prolonged by 12 percent; the economic effect per ruble of the costs invested for their realization in practice was 223 percent less. We have now formulated the task of substantially enhancing the overall efficacy of academic, branch, and university-level science.

This, of course is merely a part -- perhaps the least important part -- of the problems which are currently being worked on by the city party organization in the endeavor to find a solution. Recently the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed and approved in principle the draft concept of Moscow's comprehensive socioeconomic development in the period up to the year 2000, which defines the basic orientation up to the year 2010. A recommendation was made to further elaborate the general plan for Moscow's development, bearing in mind that it must fully respect the present problems in the life of our capital and correspond to the uniform tasks connected with the natural development of the city and Moscow oblast.

This is a weighty, principled step. Its realization will help strengthen the capital's position in the country's economic, social, and scientific-technical development and also help deepen socialist economic integration.

[Question] How are Moscow's working people contributing to the search for new economic-organizational forms and to the discovery of reserves for improving production efficiency?

[Yeltsin] We will tackle the problem of increasing the volume of industrial production, as well as the city's socioeconomic problems, by speeding up the introduction of progressive economic methods -- methods that have been widely tested within the framework of economic experiments. By this I mean, for instance, the principle of economic accountability, self-financing, and covering costs by one's own effort, on the basis of economic initiative and economic responsibility for the final results of the working collectives.

Whereas in 1984 we had 30 enterprises working under these conditions, in 1986 half of all industrial plants in Moscow worked in this manner. In January 1987 all production units in the city will start using the new economic method. The Moscow enterprises managed by the Ministry of Chemical Engineering and by certain other ministries will be working according to the principle of expanded economic accountability, cost-covering, and self-financing, which will ensure the development of production and the solution of social needs by means of expanding rights and raising responsibility for the final results of work, according to the principle of every member of the collective having an interest in the adoption of higher plan tasks and in personally contributing toward increasing the state revenues.

The party's city committee pays close attention to developing the collective forms of labor organization and remuneration. By this I mean the brigade system, the brigades using the shift index coefficient (KPP) [koefficient pracovniho podiiu]. This method is being successfully applied even in certain fraternal socialist countries. Currently it is being perfected, so that an increasing number of participants and larger units -- sectors, workshops, and whole productions -- can join the system of economic accountability relations. Analogous economic innovations exist in the services, in trade, in public catering, and in transport.

All this orients the working collectives and individual employees toward producing highly efficient work results. At the same time it plays a significant political role and helps ensure an objectively better control over the degree of work and consumption, and helps strengthen the principles of social justice.

[Question] What, in your opinion, is the place and role of party organizations in the process of restructuring the economic mechanism?

[Yeltsin] In the sphere of the economy and social construction [vystavba], the task of party committees and primary organizations is to translate the congress decisions into practical activity. Therefore, they must more profoundly affect the main, key trends of the restructuring of the economic mechanism. They must more objectively comprehend that process in all of its aspects and rid themselves of the previous stereotypes in thinking and practice, in analysis and assessment. They must comprehensively strengthen their links with the masses, study public opinion, not be afraid to consult people, not to make decisions on specific questions instead of the economic workers, as often happens, but be more demanding of them, increase their responsibility, using forms and methods of party work to develop initiative and creative affinity for work, and mold new economic thinking.

The success of this work depends on the cadres -- the economic and party cadres. An active process of renewal is underway among them. We have begun with ourselves, by assessing workers of the apparatus of the party committee, and reduced their number by almost 10 percent. We have introduced a new way of assessing the first secretaries of the CPSU municipal districts. Into the key sectors we are sending people who are competent and energetic, who not only realize the need for changes but, we hope, are also capable of carrying them through. The exchange of cadres has not finished. This process is not easy, but it is necessary. [paragraph continues]

We will not protect those who are not in step with the demands of the times, and even less those who oppose all things new. There is only one criterion for all promotions and transfers to other places: political and work qualities, ability, the actual successes of a worker, his relationship with people, his constant contact with communists and the working people.

The session of the CPSU Central Committee held last June pointed out the main theme that really must be tackled: the development of the primary organizations' activity and independence, and of communists' initiative and activity.

The party City Committee is following the work of the ministries' party organizations particularly closely. These party organizations should substantially contribute to molding the workers of these institutions, assert the modern approach to the solution of socioeconomic problems, inspire the workers to work in the new way, and to oppose ossification and stagnation with all vigor, so that they are capable of working out truly long-term plans on a scientific basis.

A demanding atmosphere of searching for and changing forms and methods of work can be created only by the joint efforts of all communists, by the all-round development of democracy within the party itself, by observing the principles of collective leadership at all levels, and by developing the flow of information [informovanost], criticism, self-criticism, control, and a responsible approach to work.

The party provides an example by its own principle mindedness and truth, and it calls on everyone to actively participate in the struggle for a new, qualitatively higher degree of development of our society. Realism, openness, the effort to fully activate the potential of socialism, of the people's possibilities, the human factor -- this is an approach that meets with general support in our country.

[Question] At the 27th CPSU Congress it was said that the organization of cooperation with the partner [druzebni] collectives in the socialist countries must be approached with more initiative, in a nontraditional manner, in a spirit of profound party-mindedness, and the Soviet working people must be more actively enlisted in this process. What has changed in Moscow in that respect?

[Yeltsin] Dozens of Moscow enterprises have friendly working ties with colleagues from the fraternal countries. For example the P.A. Babayev and Bolshevik Chocolate Works, the Second Bus Depot, the Gidroproject scientific research institute, the Ilich Locomotive Depot, the Sokolniki Railroad Car Repair Plant, the Pervomayskiy department store; and collectives in many other industrial, scientific, construction, transportation, and trade organizations have such ties with Czechoslovak friends.

In recent years, contacts among work collectives have been oriented in particular toward studying mutual experience acquired from the work of party, trade union, and youth organizations, toward including advanced equipment and technologies in enterprises, toward assimilating progressive work methods through exchanging groups of experts and leading production workers. Collectives have regularly assessed the results of the international socialist competition among partners, and the primary organizations of our friendship society have been active. All that has helped to consolidate further the relations of unshakable brotherhood among our parties, countries, and nations, and also to resolve production tasks. This kind of work is also continuing at present.

Our subway builders are a good example. The fruits of their cooperation are significant and obvious -- they are the Prague station of Moscow's subway and, on the other hand, the many projects of the Prague subway. At the same time, the friendly relations between individual collectives have often led -- let us say it openly -- to mutual paths that were of a getting-to-know-each-other nature rather than a working character.

It is pleasing that today our cooperation is marked by the mutual utilization and enrichment of work experience in all spheres of life. In light of the current tasks contained in the resolutions of the 27th CPSU and 17th CPCZ Congresses and the economic summit of the CEMA member-states, there is to be further important progress in the next few years in the development of socialist integration, and in deepening it on the basis of broad cooperation and specialization of production. The realization of the Comprehensive Program of Scientific-Technical Development of the CEMA Member-States Up to the Year 2000 is of fundamental importance. The sphere of the utilization of common potential is so broad and the forms of cooperation can be so diverse that one simply cannot do without the mutual exchange of progressive experience. In my view, the cooperation between our capitals, among the work collectives of their enterprises and organizations, must concentrate on the solution of these problems.

That is why the creation of work ties, and of concrete production and scientific-technical ties between partner enterprises, the setting up of joint ventures, scientific-production associations, and contractual cooperation is acquiring particular importance at present.

Recently, a new type of common scientific-production collectives has come into being. The Soviet-Czechoslovak ROBOT association, which has its headquarters in Presov, is an example. The Muscovites there are not only guests, but active participants in a great and important project. The Moscow Krasnyi Proletariy enterprise has become a part of a Soviet-Bulgarian association which makes machine tools. In this way we are able to make faster progress, solve our common problems faster, and make use of the existing economic potential to greater effect. All this will actively help to further strengthen Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship and cooperation, and strengthen the socialist community as a whole.

Perfecting socialism, achieving a qualitatively new level of its development, strengthening its international authority and positions in the world further -- this is our common cause, the common duty of the communists of the fraternal countries.

PRAVDA REPORTS CHERNOBYL REACTOR WORK COMPLETED

PM171513 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by PRAVDA "team" at Chernobyl AES V. Gubarev, O. Gusev, O. Ignatyev, N. Larionova, M. Odinets, and I. Tikhomirov: "Steps of Safety. The Total Isolation of the Damaged Chernobyl AES Power Unit Has Been Completed" -- first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The construction of the sarcophagus has been completed. The destroyed reactor of the No. 4 power unit has been reliably isolated. In order to appreciate the significance of this accomplishment today, it is necessary to recall the events involving the elimination of the consequences of the accident, events which occurred here, at the Chernobyl AES site, over the last few months.

Back in May all the specialists unanimously agreed: It was first and foremost necessary to eliminate the danger stemming from the gaping crater at the No. 4 power unit. [paragraph continues]

It was necessary to neutralize as quickly as possible the atom that had slipped its harness. Never before had anyone had to perform work on such a vast scale under unprecedentedly difficult conditions.

In June, when we arrived at the power station, the impressive metal sections meant for the construction of the future sarcophagus could already be seen somewhat to the right and not far from the deserted construction site of the No. 5 and 6 power units.

The sarcophagus is not just an assembly of metal sections stacked one on top of another, with concrete poured over them. It is a complex engineering structure. And how many other and equally important jobs had to be done simultaneously!

It was necessary to decontaminate the territory around the power station and to reinforce the cooling pond dike, in which 40,000 cubic meters of rock alone had to be incorporated.

It was necessary to install more than 100 filters, build new floating barriers [glukhiye pontony], and create a storage reservoir all along the perimeter of the 2-km canal.

It was necessary to commission nuclear fuel waste storage facilities consisting of a complex of premises fitted with a large range of instruments.

The construction of the sarcophagus had to begin with the creation of a "cushion" beneath the reactor and the construction of partitions in the AES machine hall to separate the No. 3 power unit from No. 4, and No. 2 from No. 3.

Why was it necessary to create a "cushion" beneath the NO. 4 power unit in the first place? Back in May Academician Ye. Velikhov said: "The reactor is damaged. Its heart, the red-hot active part, seems to be 'suspended.' We have covered the reactor from above with layers of sand, lead, boron, and clay, and this places an additional great weight on the structure. How will the reactor's red-hot crystal behave? Will it be successfully secured, or will it sink into the earth? We are facing a very complex situation. It is necessary to access the situation with the utmost accuracy and make the only correct decision, ruling out the slightest of errors."

The specialists, both practitioners and scientists, drew the conclusion that it was necessary to construct an additional concrete "cushion" beneath the reactor. We were there on the eve of the completion of work and saw how the 400 miners, who had come to Chernobyl from the Moscow and Donbass coal fields, were working. It was they who dug a 136-meter tunnel leading to the foundations of the No. 4 power unit and extracted hundreds of cubic meters of soil from beneath the reactor slab.

That is how the bottom of the sarcophagus was created. This was accompanied by the simultaneous elaboration and implementation of a plan for the erection of one of the sides of the sarcophagus -- a dividing wall cutting through the entire structure of the building from top to bottom so as to isolate the undamaged part of the power station from radiation and contamination. Assembled from reinforced blocks clad in lead sheet and filled with concrete, the wall isolated with a high degree of reliability the destroyed No. 4 power unit from the No. 3 unit where, just as in the first two units, it became possible to start decontamination work.

Preparatory work was progressing in parallel on the foundations for the creation of a wall to seal the destroyed part of No. 4 power unit structure. [paragraph continues]

An idea of the scale of this preparatory work can be obtained from the fact that each of the three concrete plants which were erected not far from the AES could have met the daily requirements for concrete used in the construction of a major GES.

The work was assigned to the collective of No. 605 Construction Administration. "Initially," its chief I. Dudorov told us, "some of our comrades had to work inside the zone of enhanced radiation 'barrage,' and naturally their daily work shifty lasted not 8 hours but just a few minutes, according to safety rules. But the work cycle had to be kept up continuously, and we organized a special rota, something like a 'continuous interaction relay,' rigorously observing the swift change of people and equipment."

In the second half of July the workers from No. 605 Construction Administration poured the first cubic meters of concrete around the destroyed reactor wall.

When the main concrete terrace was completed it became possible to start moving on to the installation of vertical blocks. The height of the sarcophagus was planned at 61 meters!

Automatic pumps were installed to ensure on around-the-clock flow of liquid concrete into the openings of the reinforced structures on the concrete terrace. Concrete mixer trucks fed them according to a strict schedule. At that stage it also became necessary to overcome newly-emerged complications involving radiation. One fleet of vehicles collected concrete from the plant and, a few kilometers away from the power station, it was reloaded into another fleet of mixers which were on permanent duty at the AES. In this way the best possible radiation conditions were maintained in the vicinity of the concrete plants.

By the end of September the sarcophagus wall had risen in giant 12-meter steps to its planned 60-meter height. The work at all states of assembly demanded utmost precision, because the installation had to be done without anything being touched by human hands. Television camera lenses followed the progress of installation, but there were none of the usual contacts making it possible to get closer, check, and correct. Everything depended on the skills of crane operators and the coordination of their actions with controllers who transmitted all necessary orders by radio.

The installation of the cascade's first step presented the greatest complexity. Once it was completed, the thick concrete layer offered the construction workers protection against radiation.

In the process of constructing the sarcophagus the installation workers drilled the interior barriers and power unit walls for balanced ventilation. The nuclear fuel concealed inside the thick concrete is now constantly under unflagging monitoring, since the ventilation system incorporates dosimetry instruments and powerful filters trapping even the tiniest particles of radioactive dust.

When the last cubic meter of concrete was poured inside the body of the sarcophagus "cascade," the time had come for another very complex operation -- the sealing of the No. 4 power unit. At the first stage it was necessary to raise to a height of 58 meters a steel frame weighing 165 metric tons to provide a base for large-diameter pipes. This task was assigned to specialists from the "Energospetsmontazh" Association.

"We had to find a solution totally without precedent in world practice," we were told by the association's chief engineer V. Andrianov. "For example, how were we to install the roof supports so they could bear the super-heavyweight metal structures? Complex questions, and we had no margin for error in their solution."

Soon the installation workers laid the last pipe on the damaged power unit, putting the reactor hall under reliable cover. The concreting of the sarcophagus roof started immediately.

Now the destroyed No. 4 power unit at Chernobyl AES has been entombed forever inside a thick ferroconcrete crypt. The most crucial stage in eliminating the consequences of accident has been completed.

All of us Soviet people pay homage to the selflessness, courage, and heroism of those who healed the wound inflicted on the country in those unusually difficult months.

The most complex period is now part of history, but the Chernobyl tragedy must not be consigned to oblivion. The time is coming to interpret the lessons of Chernobyl.

COMPARISON OF PRODUCTION CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 16 November carries in its First Edition on page 1 a report on the production conference held at the CPSU Central Committee on 14 November. Comparison of the PRAVDA report with the Moscow TASS International version published in the 14 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page R 5, reveals the following variations:

In addition to the names listed in the TASS report, PRAVDA notes that the conference was also attended by "Yu. P. Batalin, G.G. Vedernikov, L.A. Voronin, V.K. Gusev, Yu. D. Maslyukov, and I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers."

TV COOPERATES WITH FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS

LD130658 Moscow TASS in English 0641 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS -- The State Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee of the USSR cooperates with 149 organizations from 121 countries. Forms of cooperation include exchanges with socialist countries free of charge, the preparation of joint programmes, assistance for shooting teams, the filming of TV topics at the request of foreign partners, exchange of staff members.

Every day central television transmits its programmes for an average of 150.1 hours. Fifteen per cent of materials [are from] other countries, including TV films, concerts, plays and sports. Such programmes as "TV Travellers' club", "International Panorama," "In the Animal Kingdom" (for two evenings early next year the programme on animals will be devoted to the BBC's "Safari of the World" about the life of rare animals) and others, use material bought by or exchanged with Soviet partners. Most of this 15 per cent is about events taking place in the Soviet Union -- the forum of intervision member-countries in Moscow (once a year), international TV festivals: on folk art "Raduga" (once every two years), "Man and Sea" in Riga (once every three years). Both will telecast in 1987.

Interest in the life of other peoples, their culture, art, economic development, and interest in finding solutions to social problems, is sharply growing.

Increasingly popular are TV link-ups as the most lively form of communication. The next one will take place in November between New Delhi and Alma-Ata, the capital of Kazakhstan, on the subject: "Culture, Traditions and Contemporaneity". Negotiations are continuing over the Moscow-Tokyo TV bridge; and there are more and more joint productions.

LEADERS SIGN OBITUARY OF FARMING SPECIALIST

PM131357 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Nov 86 p 4

[Obituary of N.P. Aleksandrov]

[Excerpts] Soviet agricultural science has suffered a grave loss. After a protracted illness Nikolay Pavlovich Aleksandrov, eminent scientist and organizer of science, doctor of economic sciences, professor, full member of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and CPSU member since 1943, died 8 November 1986. [Passage omitted]

V.P. Nikonov, V.S. Murakhovskiy, V.A. Karlov, I.I. Skiba, V.P. Mozhin, A.I. Iyevlev, A.A. Nikonov, I.S. Shatilov, V.I. Nazarenko, V.R. Boyev, S.S. Sergeyev, and M.I. Sinyukov.

CSA CITES STOCKBREEDING, MILK PRODUCTION DATA

LD120431 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 12 Nov 86

[Text] The first month of wintering-over of cattle has passed. Data obtained by the USSR Central Statistical Administration shows that stockbreeding is developing steadily and a good rate of growth in production is being maintained. During November, 5 percent more milk and 8 percent more livestock and poultry were purchased in the country than at the same time last year.

CSA NOTES COTTON HARVESTING STATISTICS

Uzbek Harvest Behind Schedule

LD171137 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Farmers in Surkhan Darya Oblast in Uzbekistan, have begun picking cotton on their enhanced pledges account and 510,000 metric tons of raw cotton have already reached the store houses. Most of it is of fine fiber varieties. But cotton growers in other oblasts in the republic must improve their performance because schedules for raw cotton procurement are not being met. According to USSR Central Statistical Administration figures 8 million metric tons of cotton have been laid in around the country as a whole. That is 89 percent of the annual plan.

Farms in Azerbaijan have fulfilled their tasks. The plan for laying in vegetables has been 96 percent fulfilled. Farms in Georgia and Turkmenistan are lagging behind.

Tajikistan Cotton Statistics

LD171417 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Today Tajikistan's farmers began selling cotton to the state on account of enhanced pledges. According to the Central Statistical Administration, since the beginning of the harvest the Republic's procurement points hve received 911,000 metric tons of raw product. Cotton of especially valuable, fine-fiber varieties represents one third of the gathered yield -- 300,000 metric tons. The gathering of the crop is continuing. At the same time the land workers are plowing up fallows on the cleared areas, already preparing land for the next crop.

LEADERS CONTINUE TO SEND GOSR CONGRATULATIONS

Syria's Asad Sends Greetings

PM121123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[Cable of congratulations sent to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, from President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria on the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- date not given]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Comrade A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

On the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, it gives me pleasure to send you and to the friendly Soviet people cordial greetings and sincere congratulations on behalf of the Syrian people and the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party leadership.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was a great event in the life of your country and the beginning of the great victories and achievements that have been scored in the Soviet Union. Moreover, the Great October Socialist Revolution has always been an asset and a source of assistance to the peoples of the world who struggle for freedom, independence, justice, and peace.

The current relations between the Syrian Arab Republic and the Soviet Union have proved to be beneficial to both peoples and in the interest of struggle for peace and justice in the Middle East and the world. These relations have also proved that the Soviet Union is a sincere and reliable friend.

I take this opportunity to reiterate my confidence that relations between our two countries which were enshrined in the Syrian-Soviet friendship and cooperation treaty will be further strengthened and promoted.

Please accept my best wishes for your happiness and good health and for the further flourishing and great achievements and victories of the Soviet people.

Hafiz al-Asad, general secretary of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party and president of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Bulgarian Leaders' Greetings

PM101005 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Greetings message from Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and State Council chairman, and Georgi Atanasov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Council of Ministers, to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and member of the CPSU Central Committee, and Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution]

[Text] To Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

To Comrade Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

To Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Dear comrades, on behalf of the BCP Central Committee, the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the entire Bulgarian people, and on our personal behalf we send the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the fraternal Soviet people, and you personally most cordial greetings on the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Having triumphed in the name of social justice, construction, and peace, the October Revolution was an event of epochal importance, which determined the general direction and basic tendencies of world development and fundamentally changed its image. Under the leadership of Lenin's party, born in October, the first socialist country passed through harsh tests and achieved great victories and immense successes in socialist construction, and turned into the vanguard of social and human progress.

The Soviet working people are marking the anniversary of the Great October in a new situation, created by the spirit and decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. According to its character, scope, and revolutionary significance, the course for accelerating socioeconomic development and decisively reconstructing all areas of social life, and the innovative and dynamic activity of the CPSU Central Committee represent a worthy continuation of the cause of October and a creative development of Marxism-Leninism's theory and practice.

Firmly loyal to October's ideas today the USSR is an invincible support of the peoples in the struggle against imperialism's aggressive designs and actions, and to protect peace, prevent nuclear death, and save mankind.

We highly value the large-scope initiatives and bold and constructive proposals of the USSR linked with the solution of the problem of progressing toward a nuclear-free epoch in human history as a bright example of new political thought and a wise and responsible attitude by the USSR leadership toward the cardinal international problems.

An inseparable unit of the socialist community, the People's Republic of Bulgaria will further actively contribute to implementing the peaceful strategy of socialism, achieving nuclear disarmament, and preventing the militarization of space, as well as to improving the international situation.

On the day of the 69th anniversary of the October Revolution we stress again that the great importance of the USSR example and experience for modern socialist Bulgaria, and express great satisfaction with the development and high maturity of Bulgarian-USSR relations. Prompted by the indestructible, ancient friendship between our peoples, strengthened by the fraternal alliance between the BCP and the CPSU, Bulgarian-USSR relations are now being enriched by new progressive forms of cooperation. We are convinced that the implementation of the congress' decisions by our two parties will be a substantial contribution to further deepening comprehensive cooperation and coming together for the benefit of our people, and in the interest of real socialism.

From the bottom of our hearts we wish you, dear comrades, all Soviet Communists, and the fraternal Soviet people new and great successes in putting into effect the course of the 27th CPSU Congress for accelerating the USSR socioeconomic development and the struggle for peace, security and social progress throughout the world.

Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council

Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers

PRC Leaders' Greetings

PM101055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Telegram of congratulations to Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, from Li Xiannian, president of the PRC; Peng Zhen, chairman of the National People's Congress Standing Committee; and Zhao Ziyang, premier of the PRC State Council, on the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution on 6 November]

[Text] To A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

To N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

On the occasion of the 69th GOSR anniversary, on behalf of the PRC NPC Standing Committee, the PRC Government, and the Chinese people, we send our cordial congratulations and best wishes to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Soviet people.

China and the Soviet Union are two neighboring socialist countries. The Chinese people always nurture feelings of friendship towards the Soviet people and sincerely strive for substantial improvement in Chinese-Soviet relations. Thanks to the mutual efforts of both sides, ties and contacts between our countries in some areas have widened in recent years. Trade and economic relations have acquired a swifter development. We are deeply convinced that making practical steps to eliminate obstacles with the aim of normalizing the relations between the two countries and establishing friendly, good-neighborly relations between our countries based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence -- all this would correspond to the fundamental interests of the two countries' peoples, and would promote the cause of peace and stability in Asia and the whole world.

We wish you further successes in the cause of accelerating economic development of the country and raising the living standards of the people.

Li Xiannian, PRC president

Peng Zhen, chairman of the PRC Chinese National People's Congress Standing Committee

Zhao Ziyang, Premier of the PRC State Council

SOKOLOV, OTHERS SIGN WAR VETERAN'S OBITUARY

PM041311 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Oct 86 Second Edition p 4

[Obituary of Colonel General M.D. Solomatin]

[Excerpts] Colonel General Mikhail Dmitriyevich Solomatin, retired, a participant in the civil war and the Great Patriotic War has died in his 92d year after a short illness. [passage omitted] During the Great Patriotic War M.D. Solomatin commanded a tank brigade, a mechanized corps, a tank army, and subsequently he headed the staff of the armored and mechanized troops of the Soviet Army. [passage omitted]

Signed: S.L. Sokolov, S.F. Akhromeyev, V.G. Kulikov, P.G. Lushev, A.D. Lizichev, Ye. F. Ivanovskiy, I.N. Shkadov, M.D. Popkov, A.M. Mayorov, D.A. Grinkevich, V.N. Konchits, O.A. Losik, A.L. Getman, I.I. Gusakovskiy, D.D. Lelyushenko, and A.S. Gudkov.

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 223 19 November 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov Briefs Press on Geneva Arms Talks AA 1
Further Report AA 3
Gerasimov Assesses CDU-CSU AA 4
U.S. Deployment of 131st B-52 'Violated' SALT II [Fedyashin] AA 5
Speakes Confirms Deployment AA 5
Matyash Hits U.S. 3d Generation Nuclear Weapons AA 6
Joint U.S. Talks Held on Chemical Weapons Ban AA 7
Bessmertnykh Discusses Post-Reykjavik Situation [Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP 12 Nov] AA 7
Beglov Views European Stands AA 12

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Kapitsa, Kovalenko Open Asia-Pacific Forum BB 1
TASS Notes Opening of CEMA Institute Session BB 1
CEMA Nuclear Commission Meets in Moscow BB 1
CEMA Light Industry Commission Meets in Minsk BB 2
Academician Bogomolov Views CEMA Meetings BB 2

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Moscow TV Roundtable on Regional Conflicts CC 1
PRAVDA Reviews CEMA Meetings, U.S. Activities [Kotov, 16 Nov] CC 12
World TU Congress Sends Message to Gorbachev [PRAVDA 2 Nov] CC 16

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Controversy Continues Over U.S.-Iran Arms Sales A 1
Reagan Denies Shultz To Resign A 1
NPR Disagreement Cited A 1
Turkatenko Commentary A 1
Ovchinnikov Attacks Weinberger Summit Strategy [PRAVDA 18 Nov] A 2
Canada Resumes Scientific, Cultural Contacts A 3

NORTHEAST ASIA

Further Reportage on Bilateral Talks With Japan C 1
Gerasimov Briefs Press C 1
KYODO on Gorbachev Visit C 1
Institute Director Addresses Asia-Pacific Forum C 2
Moscow Rally Backs Pyongyang Youth Festival Bid C 2

Paper Claims Seoul Ignores DPRK Overtures C 3
[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Nov]
Comparison on Shevardnadze-Yanai Talks [IZVESTIYA 16 Nov] C 3

SOUTH ASIA

NEW TIMES Interviews DRA Leader Najibullah [Mironov, 10 Nov] D 1
DRA Medics Claim 'Bandits' Use Chemical Weapons D 5

EASTERN EUROPE

Shevardnadze, Bulgarian Envoy Hold 'Warm' Talk F 1
Briefs: Bulgarian Production Association F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

TASS Criticizes Remarks by Norwegian Commander [Chernyshev] G 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Islamic Conference Secretary General Received H 1
Talks With Kapitsa 15 Nov H 1
Shevardnadze-Pirzada Talks [IZVESTIYA 16 Nov] H 1
Pirzada Departs Moscow 16 Nov H 2
Gen Ivanovskiy Returns From Syria 15 Nov H 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Nov]
Moldavian Official, Delegation Received in Iraq H 2

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

PRAVDA Carries Anniversary Message to Angola [11 Nov] J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session R 1
IZVESTIYA on 17 Nov Session R 1
[18 Nov]
Soviet of Union Session R 3
Deputies Discuss Socioeconomics R 3
Budget Debate Continues R 3
Budget Debate Ends R 4
Results To Be Summarized R 4
Session Hears Criticism R 5
TASS Reports Culture Speeches R 5
TV Lists Speakers R 6
Leadership at Evening Session R 6
Third Day Agenda R 7
Soviets Hold Joint Session R 7
Gorbachev, Sokolov Attend R 8
Budget Plan Approved R 8

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Economic Management Commission Holds Session S 1
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA 16 Oct]
Voronin Addresses Economic Seminar for Ministers S 2
[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Nikonov, Others Mark Agricultural Workers Day T 1
Minister Promises Improved Bread Products [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Nov] T 1
Syr-Darya Oblast Exceeds Agricultural Targets T 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 11 Nov]

KARPOV BRIEFS PRESS ON GENEVA ARMS TALKS

LD182248 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Special program on press conference given by V.P. Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons, chief of the Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, held 18 November at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow, moderated by Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov; video shows Karpov and Gerasimov seated at Rostrum — recorded]

[Text] [Karpov] The sixth round of the talks can be described as falling into two stages — before Reykjavik and after Reykjavik. On the second stage, which we see as the most essential one, the main and most typical thing was the retreat of the U.S. side from all positive developments achieved in Reykjavik.

As a matter of fact, the U.S. side has resorted to a very simple, and I would say unbecoming device. It has preserved its old proposals, added to them those concessions that were made in Reykjavik by the Soviet side, and presented them as new proposals. It appeared that this odd mixture proved to be worse than the position that the United States in fact had when they came to the talks at the start of the sixth round in September of last year. This typical detail, I believe, is not always perceived by the observers who write about the sixth round of the talks. But that is very typical.

To substantiate this I shall cite an example. In Reykjavik, the United States undertook an obligation not to abandon the ABM treaty for 10 years. Mutual understanding was reached on this account. Following that, the U.S. delegation offers another version in their proposals: that the United States can only take a limited obligation not to abandon the ABM treaty for 10 years, but provided that they are granted the possibility to deply the Strategic Defense Initiative. That is, in fact, they reserve the right for themselves to walk out of the ABM treaty during those 10 years under any pretext, while formally taking such obligation.

As for the question of laying down restrictions between actions which are permitted and those which are forebidden, which was also discussed in Reykjavik, and on which Foreign Minister Shevardnadze make specific and precise proposals at his press conference, the U.S. side is altogether avoiding this question assiduously, for instance, in respect to offensive weapons. What is essentially involved is that the second stage is just the stage of elimination of ballistic missiles. Everything relating to the agreement reached in Reykjavik -- and I can testify to that as a witness -- in respect to the possibility of eliminating during the course of the second stage, the second 5-year period, not only ballistic missiles, but also other strategic offensive weapons, and if circumstances permit, all nuclear weapons of the United States and the Soviet Union -- this accord is being denied altogether.

Let us take a third example, an example relating to medium-range missiles in Europe. There was discussion of the Soviet Union making concessions and agreeing not in include the British and French nuclear weapons. We agreed to such concessions. But we agreed to these concessions precisely within the framework of a general complex of the understandings reached in Reykjavik.

Now they tell us that the issue of medium-range missiles should be resolved separately; and what is more, in such a way that the United States receives the right to deploy its medium-range missiles, totaling 100 warheads, in such a way as to be within reach of the territory of the Soviet Union. Whereas we propose, and we state, that no medium-range missiles located in Asia can reach the territory of the United States; and that the United States should deploy in the same manner those 100 warheads that they insist upon.

So, in essence, the United States is even moving toward rejecting our proposal that the Soviet medium-range missiles should not reach the territory of the United States, but this is only so they can deploy their medium-range missiles in such a way that they could reach the territory of the Soviet Union. So, there you have three such examples from three areas.

On 7 November the Soviet Union submitted detailed proposals that express both the spirit and the letter of Reykjavik. These proposals cover the whole gamut of issues that were discussed in Reykjavik, on which accord was reached and on which directions have been indicated that might be used to bring the sides' positions closer together. These proposals, as I have already said, virtually cover everything on which an accord could be achieved. So, we submitted them on the 7th and within a few days the talks on this round concluded.

The U.S. side virtually did not wish to discuss in a serious way the all-embracing, complex proposals of the Soviet Union that had been submitted. We proposed that the next round of the talks should begin in December. We came up against resistance from the U.S. delegation, and it was only after long and stubborn persuasion that the United States agreed to hold a short meeting of representatives of the two delegations at the beginning of December to continue discussions.

We are hoping that at this meeting the United States will get down to discussing the Soviet proposals and give a clear-cut response to them without waiting for the next official round to open, that is, on 15 January. Well, it is possible to hope for a positive response, of course; we'll wait and see. That is what I would like to say about this round.

The second question I would like to discuss is the question regarding the Budapest proposals on conventional armaments and on a reduction in troops and armaments in Europe.

This question in the West now, in NATO circles and particularly in European circles, is being put more and more to the forefront as a kind of brake to solve the issue regarding nuclear weapons in Europe.

A special working group has been set up by NATO which is examining the Budapest proposals, but as yet there has been no response. They keep telling us that this group has still not completed its work, and it will still be working on it until December.

I have to tell you that, according to the decision of the Warsaw Pact, a working group has also been set up within its framework which is also dealing with the Budapest proposals, and that is an examination of questions on how best to implement them in the most practical way.

Today, a session of this working group is being held in Sofia, There will, no doubt, be an announcement about it tomorrow, and about the results of its work.

But I would like to say one main thing, and that is, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has already said, we are in favor of contacts between NATO and the Warsaw Pact with the purpose of discussing questions of the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons. So, we are hoping that now, when the working group of the Warsaw Pact comes out with an appeal to the NATO contries, the NATO countries will ultimately respond in a positive manner to this appeal, and the contacts between the two blocs with the objective of solving questions on the limitation and reduction of conventional armaments can acquire real substance.

[Gerasimov] Question, please.

[FRG Radio Correspondent in Russian] With what objective is the Soviet Union now continuing the talks in Geneva, knowing that the White House is not agreeable to signing a treaty on a package of all your proposals?

[Karpov] But we are not giving up hope that as a result of the talks the U.S. side will look more attentively at those arguments that have been put forward by the Soviet side, that common sense will finally win the day in the U.S. Administration, and that sensible and real agreements in the field of nuclear armaments will be achieved. The necessity for such agreements is dictated by objective reality. That is why there is no getting away from solving them; one way or another they must be solved.

[ASSOCIATED PRESS correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] Tell us, please, will the forthcoming working meeting in December be devoted to one single issue, or, as is being reported from Washington, will attention there be focused mainly on space weapons?

[Karpov] I don't know where they get such information in Washington. [chuckles] We left it with the U.S. delegation that what was left uncompleted during the course of the sixth round would continue to be discussed. We, for our part, are expecting from the U.S. delegation a response — preferably a positive one — to our proposals that were submitted on 7 November. These proposals cover all three directions of the talks.

[Studio announcer] Comrade Karpov also replied to other journalists' questions.

Further Report

LD182316 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] Will nuclear and conventional arms get a reduction? What is to become of the Soviet nuclear moratorium when it expires next January? Why does Mikhail Gorbachev expect [as heard] to visit India? These and other questions were answered at a briefing for newsmen that was held at the press center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Tuesday. The briefing was held by Gennadiy Gerasimov, in charge of the information department of the Foreign Ministry, and Viktor Karpov, who leads the Soviet delegation to the Geneva talks with the United States on nuclear and space arms. [passage omitted]

Viktor Karpov noted that more people in the West were claiming that reductions in conventional arms and arms forces in Europe were a brake of sorts for a cut in nuclear arms on the continent.

Meanwhile NATO has been giving no reply to the proposals advanced by the Warsaw Treaty nations to bring about a reduction of this kind from the Atlantic to the Ural Mountains. NATO has formed a special working group to tackle this issue, but the West has been rejecting talks so far. The working group that has been set up in the framework of the Warsaw Treaty Organization is ready to enter into contacts with NATO representatives. We hope, said Viktor Karpov, that these contacts will get underway eventually.

Asked what would happen after 1st January, when the Soviet nuclear moratorium expires, he said this must be decided at the end of the year with due account for all the circumstances. He said there is a limit to the Soviet Union's patience. We can't observe the moratorium indefinitely, said the Soviet Foreign Ministry representative. One day we'll have to take a decision and this depends on whether an agreement will be reached to stop the tests. Viktor Karpov said the Soviet Union was ready for immediate and full-scale talks with the United States on this problem and it was ready to solve it, no matter what variant it may take. The objective, he added, is to stop nuclear testing of any kind.

At a briefing at the Soviet Foreign Ministry press center, asked why Mikhail Gorbachev aimed to visit India, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said the following:

[Begin Gerasimov recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] For years the Soviet Union and India have been friends. In the last few years Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has visited the Soviet Union three times. The aim of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit is to further friendship and cooperation with India. [end recording]

Gerasimov Assesses CDU-CSU

LD181447 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — The foreign-policy part of the recently published election platform of the Federal Republic of Germany's governing parties — the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Christian Social Union (CSU) — includes a number of planks which are incompatible with the interests of security and peaceful cooperation in Europe, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Department, said here today.

He was speaking in the ministry's press center at a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen.

"This program," Gerasimov said, "contains a thesis on a temporary nature of the borders, which contradicts the commitment, made by the FRG under the Moscow Treaty of 1970, to see the borders of all states in Europe as inviolable both now and in the future."

"The foreign-policy section of the platform does not show a realistic approach either to European affairs or the pressing problems of strengthening peace or to disarmament," the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

"In words, the two parties stand for cuts in nuclear arms, while in fact, they support SDI, repeating claims about its allegedly defensive and non-nuclear nature," he said.

"It is even being asserted," Gerasimov added, "that those renouncing this missile defense system are helping the Soviet Union along to world ascendancy."

The Soviet spokesman also said that the CDU-CSU program reeked of unfriendliness towards the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries and that it could only contribute to adding still more obstacles to developing constructive and stable relations between West Germany and these countries.

U.S. DEPLOYMENT OF 131ST B-52 'VIOLATED' SALT II

LD181956 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS — The TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin reports:

The Reagan administration, having firmly taken the road of abandoning the most important treaty obligations in the sphere of nuclear arms control, has already violated the basic provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty.

Washington has been accused of this by deputy director of the influential public organization, Arms Control Association, James Rubin. He said in Washington today that the 131st B-52 strategic bomber equipped with cruise missiles with nuclear warheads left the hangers of the auxiliary air base in San Antonio, Texas, and that this shows that the USA has already gone beyond the limits of the SALT-2 treaty.

The bomber was re-equipped as a nuclear missile carrier and deployed at the air base on November 12. The SALT-2 treaty, as is known, envisages the limit of 1,320 units for the number of mirved strategic missiles and bombers with cruise missiles.

The newspaper WASHINGTON POST writes today that a number of high representatives of the administration who asked that their names should not be given also hold that the treaty has already been abandoned since a modified bomber cannot be registered by Soviet technical means of monitoring. The newspaper notes that under the provisions of the treaty, missiles and bombers with cruise missiles must be registered after they leave shops, plants or other facilities.

Speakes Confirms Deployment

LD182123 Moscow TASS in English 2103 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS — The Reagan administration has firmly embarked on the road of torpedoing the crucial treaty commitments in the field of nuclear arms control and does not intend further to adhere to the critical provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty.

Larry Speakes, White House deputy press secretary, told a briefing here today that since the SALT-2 treaty was not ratified, it did not exist. He recalled the U.S. President's statement to the effect that the United States would not any longer observe those agreements.

Speakes confirmed that the 131st B-52 bomber equipped with cruise-missiles would be fielded late this year.

MATYASH HITS U.S. 3D GENERATION NUCLEAR WEAPONS

LD1811725 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 18 Nov 86

["Soviet Moratorium — Time of Decisions" — TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — TASS political news analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik has highlighted still more forcefully that the problem of freezing nuclear explosions and reaching an accord on a total ban on nuclear tests became one of those watersheds through which the border between the old and new mentality runs.

The Soviet Union's drive to stop all nuclear blasts draw tremendous response all over the world. The move wins more and more supporters each time the Soviet Union extends its unilateral moratorium.

A year and five months without tests is already a political and military reality. It is the manifestation in practice of new thinking in international affairs.

The socialist countries, the conference of the Non-aligned Movement in Harare, representing over 100 states, the leaders of the "Delhi Six", numerous public organizations and trade unions, authoritative political parties in the West, including the West German Social-Democrats and the British Labourites, and prominent scientists across the world supported the Soviet moratorium and urged the United States to follow the USSR's example. Broad sections of the U.S. public and the considerable part of Congress back up the idea of terminating nuclear tests.

Meanwhile, the land in the Nevada desert continues to be shaked with convulsions. Contrary to common sense and the imperative of the time, the United States has already conducted the 23rd nuclear weapon test there since the movement when the Soviet moratorium was announced. Resistance to a halt to the nuclear arms race on the part of the current U.S. Administration and the powerful military-industrial complex is stout.

The Soviet Union scrupulously complies with the moratorium. Silence reigns at the Soviet test sites. But at this very time the United States goes ahead with nuclear explosions, perfects new types of nuclear armaments. The point at issue is, first and foremost, the development of space strike weapons for offensive, aggressive purposes. There are plans to put third-generation nuclear weapons designed to strike targets in space and to hit ground, maritime and air targets.

It is precisely third-generation nuclear weapons that call the attention of the Pentagon which views them among the crucial ones in the set of space strike weapons to be used in "Star Wars".

On the banks of the Potomac they do not conceal that American specialists currently regard lasers powered by a nuclear explosion and nuclear weapons with an enhanced electromagnetic impulse as the most promising types of such weapons. They are given priority in plans to develop the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative".

The moment of truth has come now, the truth that the Soviet moratorium is the unique historic chance for all states to do away with the nuclear arms race. History will not pardon those who will fail to make use of this chance.

JOINT U.S. TALKS HELD ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS BAN

LD190400 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0321 GMT 19 Nov 86

["Soviet-U.S. Talks on Chemical Weapons Held" — TASS headline]

[Text] New York, 19 Nov (TASS) — The fourth round of Soviet-U.S. talks on all aspects of the problem of concluding an effective and monitorable international convention on the universal and total banning of chemical weapons was held in New York from 28 October to 18 November. The USSR delegation put forward new initiatives at the talks on guarantees of the nonproduction of chemical weapons in the commercial (civilian) industry, and on on-site inspection on request. The USSR delegation at the talks was headed by Ambassador V.L. Israelyan, Collegium member of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the U.S. delegation by Ambassador D. Lowitz. [title as received]

BESSMERTNYKH DISCUSSES POST-REYKJAVIK SITUATION

AU101341 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP (supplement) in Hungarian 12 Nov 86 p 5

[Interview given by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, to MAGYAR HIRLAP staffer Pal Bokor: "After Reykjavik" — date and place not given]

[Text] [MAGYAR HIRLAP] What is the future of Soviet-American relations? This seems to be the most important question among those of key importance relating to world political affairs after Reykjavik, and after some other events taking place since then. You were the head of one of the Soviet delegations in Reykjavik. Great expectations were attached to the summit and it was only natural on that particular Sunday that journalists — I am not talking about diplomats — were somewhat disappointed. Since then, however, we have heard nothing from either side other than there is no need for disappointment, Reykjavik was a success after all.

[Bessmertnykh] Such an analysis can only come from Geneva. There we agreed on three things. First: We will endeavor to improve Soviet-American relations. Second: We will speed up the disarmament talks in Geneva. Third: We will not endeavor to obtain military superiority and will try to exclude the possiblity of a nuclear war.

Following the Geneva summit the months of November and December passed. In January the Soviet Union came up with a comprehensive program of disarmament, giving the Americans a chance to join us on the path of action in the most important sphere of relations. This was followed by our unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests and by the initiative of the socialist countries concerning conventional weapons. This means that for our part, in the spirit of the Geneva agreement, we drew up a broad and concrete program for action, for both the Americans and the whole world to see. We did this in the belief that the continuation of this process would also include a summit meeting.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Mikhail Gorbachev's Washington visit was almost certain.

[Bessmertnykh] The reaction of the American Administration, however, was unfortunately not to our liking. As you know, the main characteristic of our relations is that for us the central issue of the whole system of relations is composed of security questions, where questions of nuclear and space armament represent the axis. I only mention this to indicate that people could judge the situation of Soviet-American relations by the Geneva issue. While economic, humanitarian, cultural, and other issues may indicate the degree of relations with other countries, these issues are only of peripheral value in Soviet-American relations. We cannot judge the level of relations by the number of ballet performances and exhibitions. For us the most significant index has always been the questions of nuclear and space weapons. If there is progress in this field, then relations are improving and if there is no progress, they are stagnating. Returning to the issue of Geneva, we reached a stalemate. The Americans were performing a ritual dance around their own proposals submitted on 1 November, and we could not take a single step forward. Then, at the beginning of the summer we decided to unlock the process of normalization and create a mechanism — this was Comrade Gorbachev's idea, and he explained it in his letter to Reagan — for preparing the foreign ministerial meeting in the fall. This was an almost unprecedented solution, involving the operation of around 10 working groups in the most diverse areas. The most important group, of course, was the one dealing with nuclear and space weapons at the expert level. Both of the groups were working with experts. [sentence as published] The American side agreed to this and, as a result, we have had a rather hot summer. In August and at the beginning of September our experts were busy discussing nuclear weapons, including space weapons, as well as regional and bilateral problems. In this way it was possible to create good practical conditions for a serious and objective discussion between Shevardnadze and Shultz. Yet all these actions were parallel to certain extremely unfavorable American actions, such as the expelling of Soviet diplomats working in New York, the attack on Libya, and the arrest of Zakharov. It was an extremely gross action to expel 25 Soviet citizens from New York just 1 day prior to the foreign ministerial meeting. This means that there were two opposing processes going on at the same time. One for creating some kind of relations, and another for ruining it.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] In any case, nothing much has happened in Geneva where the most important issues should have been discussed.

[Bessmertnykh] This is true. Following the experts' discussions, the Soviet leadership again examined the situation and came to the conclusion that, in spite of an intensive effort, relations are still in a stalemate both in general and in Geneva. This was clear from our discussions with Nitze, Kampelman, and Perle. All three of them came to Moscow, and we held talks in the Foreign Ministry's dacha in Meshcherino near Moscow, and this was followed by our team's visit to Washington. However, nothing much was achieved by these talks. Therefore, Gorbachev wrote a letter to Reagan — this was on 15 September — which was then passed on by our foreign minister, Shevardnadze. In this letter, Gorbachev suggested an urgent working meeting in preparation for the Washington visit. In his letter Comrade Gorbachev explained clearly that the situation of the talks is disturbing, and the talks need a strong political push to move forward, and this can only be done through a meeting and a dialogue on the highest level. This is how the idea of Reykjavik was conceived. The Americans chose this town, but we also proposed London. They also accepted the date, but we told them that we would be ready to lay aside all our work to make this meeting.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Our readers know what the Soviet proposals at the Reykjavik meeting contained, but opinions differ as to their meaning and aims. As a member of a Soviet delegation, what do you see as the unusualness of these proposals?

[Bessmertnykh] They differ above all because we have come up with a completely new idea regarding the curb on strategic arms. [paragraph continues]

The 50-percent reduction mentioned here is different from all the previous 50-percent reductions proposed by either the Soviet Union or the United States. The Soviet side had previously referred to a 50-percent reduction of those strategic nuclear weapons that are able to reach the territory of the other side. In other words, it referred to the so-called forward based systems [eloretolt allasban] and to the medium-range missiles. When the Americans spoke about a 50-percent reduction of strategic arms, they were thinking above all about ballistic missiles. Our present proposal refers to all kinds of weapons included in the triangle of strategic arms: a 50-percent reduction of intercontinental ballistic missiles, a 50-percent reduction of submarine launched ballistic missiles, and a 50-percent reduction of heavy bombers This concept means the following: Nuclear confrontation will be reduced to one-half, while the structure of the historically developed strategic offensive weapons will be maintained completely. This is simple, but this simplicity gives the idea its brilliance, and this is the particular element that most commentators somehow failed to notice. At the Reykjavik talks on medium-range missiles — this is, of course, a paradox — we insisted on the acceptance of the American proposal.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] That is, on the acceptance of Reagan's zero option.

[Bessmertnykh] Yes, the zero option. The President and the secretary of state became stubborn for a while and insisted on an initial solution that would, of course, assume the retention of a certain number of missiles in Europe. As a result of an intensive dialogue, however, the Americans agreed to a zero option in Europe. In the meantime, we agreed to significantly reduce the Soviet medium-range missiles in Asia. What we wanted was to set off a concrete process of reducing nuclear arms. This aim is noble enough for us to agree to concrete concessions. We also heeded the interests of Western European countries, the whole of Europe, that is, the interests of Western and Eastern Europe, both of which would like to live without weapons. Furthermore, we considered the interests of the Asian countries and, of course, those of the entire socialist camp. This is how we arrived at working out a series of very interesting and, what is more, very realistic formulas concerning the medium-range missiles in Europe. The Americans received the right to fit as many warheads to medium-range missiles here in our area [nalunk], on the continental part [kontinentalis reszen] of the United States, as we do, that is 100 warheads. [sentence as published]

Of course, we also discussed the question of endearing the ABM Treaty, and here we had a clash of two concepts. Afterwards Reagan asked us why we refused the agreement due to one single word. Well, in this case, each single word has a strategic importance.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Why was it necessary to endorse the ABM Treaty if it has been in force without a deadline since 1972? Yet the Soviet Union has put a sharp accent on this question.

[Bessmertnykh] This is very simple. It was necessary because we agreed to a 50-percent reduction of strategic arms over 5 years and the total elimination of these arms over the following 5 years. Therefore, the Soviet Union as a responsible power cannot accept the making of such vital steps in nuclear disarmament "without securing its hinterland", and without securing all the conditions that would enable us to endeavor to acomplish these deep cuts in a peaceful manner, without mutual distrust, and in an atmosphere of confidence. This is obvious, and it would be strange to accept the reduction of the most significant weapons or even their total elimination, while the other side could acquire new types of weaponry threatening the security of the Soviet Union.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] I think we seldom hear about the SDI, the space defense initiative, being presented to international public opinion as a purely defensive system.

[Bessmertnykh] As long as there are nuclear arms, the space defense initiative creates a danger for us, despite all its defensive nature. Looking at SDI in the presence of strategic nuclear arms, which incidentally are at present being modernized in the United State., it is dangerous precisely bacause of its defensive nature, since it provides a first-strike capacity to its possessor. The side hiding behind such a system is trying to exclude the possiblity of a counterattack. If we assume circumstances without strategic nuclear weapons, SDI would still continue to be a danger because there are offensive elements in the system itself. If somebody is trying to use a new physical phenomena in destroying nuclear warheads in outer space, he could obviously also use the very same systems under atmospheric and terrestrial conditions. This is all the more true, because the Americans themselves are talking a lot about developing systems to destroy missiles in their climbing phase. These systems, therefore, have their own offensive potential and not even the American side denies this. In this respect a question has arisen, which was put to Ronald Reagan by Mikhail Gorbachev: All right, you say that SDI is aimed against ballistic missiles and indeed, this is the concept of the program. Nevertheless, if we have now agreed on eliminating all ballistic missiles without exception, along with the rest of the strategic triangle, thus approaching the practical elimination of all nuclear arms, then what is SDI for?

The Reagans' advisors have prepared two versions of the answer. One of them says: What happens if one side wanted to cheat the other? This answer is unacceptable, because we are the side promoting the stricter verification measures. We are prepared to jointly work out a system of verification that would make the above-mentioned assumption impossible, that is, one side cheating the other.

The other answer by Reagan was that, despite a realiable system of verification, a madman could acquire an atomic bomb, and in such a case the United States could only protect itself with the SDI. This sounds like a joke, but we have indeed heard this argument, and it was repeated several times in Reykjavik alone. In our answer we explained precisely and clearly that our 15 January proposals included the concept of creating a global system of verification and guarantees which would prevent nuclear terrorism. Thus, it is beyond doubt that this question can be solved.

It is probably, therefore, that this was not the case at issue. Our analysis is unambiguous. We have reviewed all possible variations and reached a definite conclusion. There is a fresh attempt to gain superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist community. We have, however, told the American partners that this will lead nowhere, they should not waste their money.

As for the ABM treaty, we requested that none of the parties would use its right to discontinue the observance of the treaty. Thus, the treaty would remain as it was, without a deadline. Of course, the participating parties would not be able to carry out tests on elements of antimissile weaponry in space. This is namely prohibited by the agreement. So this was our condition, and we even emphasized that research and testing may continue under laboratory conditions.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] A few days ago, THE NEW YORK TIMES carried a report according to the Soviet side, at the next meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Secretary of State George Shultz in Vienna, could perhaps even declare tests on SDI outside the laboratory to be acceptable.

[Bessmertnykh] In our view it is possible to carry out tests in the area of antimissile defense by way of land-based, stationary systems. This is permitted by the treaty. However, it categorically forbids testing in outer space. The Americans have insisted on allowing the parties to develop a space defense system after the 10 years have expired. But first, this again could only be possible by completely upsetting the ABM Treaty. [paragraph continues]

Second, it would also assume that not only the United States but even the Soviet Union has been preparing to set up a space defense system. However, if the Americans do opt for setting up this system, we will be choosing another way. We have our own calculations, which are not the same as those of the American plans in an engineering, technological sense. It will be a worthy and suitable answer.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Let us now return to the prospects for Soviet-American relations after Reykjavik.

[Bessmertnykh] We are willing to wait. We are willing to wait for the American Administration to carefully examine the results of the Reykjavik talks and decide upon the path it intends to go in the future; or put more simply, until it has solved the question of whether the American Administration is able to extract itself from the net of the military-industrial complex. It was clearly evident in Reykjavik that such a net exists. The President was not able to make decisions on his own. One could feel that he did not have enough power. We must wait and see what the future brings. We on our side are still willing to adhere to the agreements which were reached in Reykjavik. We are ready to follow the path of nuclear disarmament and peace in space, and at the same time to participate in solving other problems, the questions of chemical weapons, and of conventional arms. In other words, the question is: Are the Americans capable of changing their approach to today's problems according to the demands of the end of the 20th century? If they are, all roads toward settling our relations are free.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] You have mentioned that Reagan was not, in fact, free to make decisions. On the other hand, there are also more moderate forces in American political affairs. For instance, just a few days ago former President Carter strongly criticized the policy of his successor, referring precisely to the space defense initiative. Here is the question: Based on purely diplomatic assumptions, would it not be more favorable, more reliable, to simply "play a waiting game" until the political conditions of power in the United States have changed?

[Bessmertnykh] As to your question, the answer is negative. In general, our tactical approach is that we do not adjust our foreign policy and diplomatic considerations to actual American domestic struggles at a particular moment. This would bear no results, and for us the golden rule is to work with a government that is elected by the American people. Therefore, we do not intend to freeze the movement toward agreements, we do not intend to put the already emerging trends on ice. This would only cause a great loss of time. In addition, we do not believe that the present American Government has exhausted all its resources in terms of common sense and rationality; and it is possible that if it calmly evaluates all circumstances, it will still find it possible to give a favorable answer. Thus, we are willing to work with this government, and will be working with it.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] In this respect, could we say that the preparations for Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Washington are still going on?

[Bessmertnykh] The greatest step in preparing the Washington trip was made in Reykjavik. We will see how things turn out. The most important thing is that the question of the Washington visit by the general secretary of the CPSU is still on the agenda. Preparations are continuing for this important event. At the same time, what we can expect from this visit is well-known, since this is why we met in Reykjavik. It is inadmissable that, following the meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik, the official visit of the CPSU general secretary to the United States should end with no results. Preparations must be made and guarantees must be given that the hopes of the people we have been talking about will come true, that the world can breathe easier, and that we will finally reach some agreements. [paragraph continues]

Well, the prepartory work will continue, but this work must go on on both sides; and it is very important for the American Administration to also actively participate in preparing Comrade Gorbachev's Washington visit.

Beglov Views European Stands

LD172223 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The lessons of Reykjavik and European security is the subject of the commentary by Spartak Beglov, APN political observer:

[Beglov] Hello, comrades! The recent trip by Margaret Thatcher, head of the British Government, across the ocean and her talks with President Reagan in Camp David took place at a time when the whole world is assimilating the lessons of Reykjavik. As far as Western Europe is concerned, the stance of the governments, especially of the NATO member states, is not identical. Some ponder the possibilities of coming closer to the prospect of a non-nuclear world, others -- strange as it might seem -- are concerned with ways of helping Washington to move even futher away from the boundaries approached in Reykjavik.

The echo of the debates recently held in the Bonn Bundestag on the results of the post-Reykjavik visit to Washington by another West European leader, FRG Chancellor Kohl, is still resounding. Kohl was made to face a serious, and an evidently just reproach. That is, Kohl, instead of encouraging the U.S. Administration to consolidate and develop what was achieved in Reykjavik, sought new arguments against total elimination of nuclear armaments, along with yet again expressing his solidarity with the SDI program. Judging from all, the same mood prevailed during Mrs Thatcher's conversations in Camp David.

In some NATO capitals, they are trying to pretend that nothing happened, as if the USSR had made not steps toward the United States and its partners on the issues of nuclear weapons, as if the proposals of the socialist countries on considerable, well-balanced cuts in armaments and conventional forces over the entire space from the Atlantic to the Urals do not exist for them. Is that a shortage of new thinking? Unfortunately, yes.

In the meantime, the Soviet proposals in Reykjavik are an example of a truly constructive and all-embracing approach to the issues of disarmament. The starting point of this approach is that it is no longer possible to rely on weapons, especially nuclear weapons, as a means of preserving peace and security. It was precisely Reykjavik that showed a turning-point toward a non-nuclear world and a non-nuclear Europe. The double game in the spirit of reviewing the outcome of Reykjavik and promotion of the SDI program are only capable of tightening the nuclear-space noose even more around the issues of disarmament. It is only possible to undo it through embarking on the path of mutually acceptable agreements in accordance with the Reykjavik package. That is in the interests of security of one and all.

KAPITSA, KOVALENKO OPEN ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM

LD181037 Moscow TASS in English 1006 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — An international scientific conference on the subject "International Relations and Topical Issues of Ensuring Peace and Security in the Far East" has opened at the Institute of the Far East of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR today. The conference is being attended by scientists and members of research centres in Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and representatives of a number of Soviet research institutions.

The conference opened with addresses of greetings by professor Ivan Kovalenko, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Mikhail Kapitsa, USSR deputy foreign minister.

The three-day forum will cover problems pertaining to ensuring cooperation in Asia and the Pacific. The point at issue will be Soviet proposals set forth in the documents of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in Vladivostok. Scientists will exchange views on problems caused by the buildup of the militaristic efforts of the USA, Japan and South Korea, on questions pertaining to outlining ways and methods of ensuring security in the Asian-Pacific region, economic cooperation and economic security.

TASS NOTES OPENING OF CEMA INSTITUTE SESSION

LD181517 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — The 34th session of the Academic Council of the CEMA Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System opened in Moscow today. it will specify the spheres of the institute's work in 1986-1990. Delegations of scientists will take part in the scientific conference "New Tasks and Problems of the Development of Economic Cooperation of the CMEA Member Countries in the Setting of Decisions of the Fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties".

CEMA NUCLEAR COMMISSION MEETS IN MOSCOW

LD181251 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov (TASS) -- Issues relating to interaction in speeding up the development of nuclear power engineering are being discussed at the 51st session of the CEMA Standing Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of the Use of Nuclear Power For Peaceful Purposes which opened here today. The program for the construction of nuclear power stations and heat-supply nuclear stations for up to the year 2000 remains one of the priority directions in the joint work of the scientists from fraternal countries. The delegates will also discuss matters connected with the participation of socialist countries in organizing an international safety procedure for nuclear power engineering.

CEMA LIGHT INDUSTRY COMMISSION MEETS IN MINSK

LD181513 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Minsk November 18 TASS -- The tasks of accelerating the development of the consumer goods industry are being considered by the 47th meeting of the CEMA Standing Commission for Cooperation in Light Industry, which opened in Minsk, capital of Soviet Belorussia, today. The agenda of the meeting includes the organization of joint projects to develop advanced technology and processes and automated control systems for the industry. The delegates are considering possibilities for extending direct relations with a view to co-production ventures in the consumer goods industry.

ACADEMICIAN BOGOMOLOV VIEWS CEMA MEETINGS

LD182304 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with Academician O.T. Bogomolov, director of the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, by unidentified reporter -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Bogomolov] The last 2 weeks of November have been marked with significant events for relations between the CEMA member countries. A meeting of CEMA was held recently in Bucharest, and a meeting of first secretaries and general secretaries of the fraternal parties was held in Moscow. There is nothing extraordinary or unusual in the fact that these conferences were held. The leaders of governments and parties meet regularly in order to discuss relevant issues of development of the new society, to exchange information and opinions, and to take counsel. But it is clear that when the highest-ranking leaders meet around the table, very major, key issues of strategy are involved. And as we know from the concluding report of the meeting in Moscow, fundamental problems of the futher development and improvement of cooperation among the countries of socialism were discussed.

It is clear that the state of affairs in the various countries of socialism differs. But at the same time, they also encounter a number of mutually relevant issues, such as the need to make a fuller use of the potential of socialism for accelerating scientific and technical progress, for raising the productivity of labor, and asserting the socialist way of life. There are a considerable number of difficulties and unresolved issues in these fields as well, and one should take counsel and exchange experience.

As we know from the concluding report, special prominence was attached to the issues of further expanding technical cooperation among the CEMA countries. They were discussed in detail at the CEMA session, but there are also major issues which call for the attention of the party leaders. Significant successes have been reached in this cooperation, but the CEMA participants are concerned over many aspects of its development. In particular, the expansion of trade turnover lacks dynamism, many commodities which are delivered on a reciprocal basis are low quality and do not meet world standards. Specialisation of production among these countries, the scientific-technical and production cooperation -- the main line along which the reciprocal exchange of commodities can expand -- has not yet been given enough prominence. In short, there are quite a lot of issues arising in the course of mutual relations of the CEMA countries, which need to be discussed and resolved.

MOSCOW TV ROUNDTABLE ON REGIONAL CONFLICTS

LD182253 Mosow Television Service in Russian 1555 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Roundtable discussion entitled: "Regional Conflicts in a Nuclear Age" presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov; with Harold Saunders, former U.S. assistant secretary of state for the Near East and South Asia; Robert Naumann, former U.S. ambassador in Afghanistan, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia; Philip Stewart, U.S. coordinator of the Dartmouth meetings and director of the USSR foreign policy research program at Ohio University; Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, "head" of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov, deputy director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute; and Viktor Grigoryevich Korgun, senior researcher at the Oriental Studies Institute; in Moscow; date not given; U.S. officials speak in English with superimposed Russian translation; video shows participants seated around table -- recorded]

[Text] [Seyful-Mulyukov] Hello, comrades. Prominent Soviet and U.S. political scientists are taking part in our television program. I will introduce them later. They met in Moscow at the sessions of the regional conflicts working group within the framework of the so-called Dartmouth Conferences. They are called so after the name of the college in the town of Hannover in the U.S. State of New Hampshire and they have been taking place for more than quarter of a century. They meet alternatly in the United States and in the Soviet Union and prominent academics, businessmen, politicians and cultural figures take part in them. It is necessary to stress that within the framework of the Dartmouth conferences the Soviet-U.S. dialogue continued even during periods when talks between our countries at government level were infrequent. The sessions of Dartmouth Conferences and its working groups discuss, within a wider context, aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations, key problems of disarmament, and regional conflicts. And now it is time to introduce the participants in our program. I will start with our U.S. guests.

Harold Saunders, former assistant U.S. secretary of state for the Near East and South Asia. He is one of the authors of the known Camp David accord. I will not forestall our discussion and I think that the role of this accord will be discussed in our conversation. Mr Saunders is currently a member of the board of the U.S. enterprise Institute for Public Political Research. This institute is engaged both in scientific research and in advising the White House, in particular, on the Near East. Harold Saunders plays a prominent role in its work. He is the U.S. cochairman of the regional conflicts working group within the framework of the Dartmouth Conference.

Robert Naumann, former U.S. ambassador in Afghanistan, Morocco and Saudi Arabia. During Ronald Reagan's inauguration Newman -- if my memory does not betray me -- was a member of the presidential group on taking over the State Department affairs. Mr Newman is now the head of the near east programme at the Strategic and Intenational Research Center at the very prestigious Georgetown University.

Philip Stewart, U.S. coordinator of the Dartmouth meetings, director of the USSR Foreign Policy Research Program at Ohio University, professor of political sciences.

I will cut short the introduction of the Soviet participants in the roundtable -- I think they will not be offended because our viewers know them well. Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov has been for many years the USSR cochairman of the regional conflicts working group within the framework of the Dartmouth Conference.

He has been studying the historic and scientific aspects of the present-day Near East problems for a long time. Comrade Primakov is now heading one of the leading humanities institutes of the Academy of Sciences -- the World Economics and International Relations Institute.

Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov, deputy director of this institute, doctor of historical sciences, is taking part in our program too; and also Viktor Grigoryevich Korgun, senior researcher at the oriental studies institute.

Military conflicts, hotbeds of war, have been present in various parts of the world for many years. Some reckon that an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations should take place, first of all, through the resolution of conflict situations which destablilize the international situation and U.S.-Soviet relations themselves. There is also another point of view: The main key to improving the entire international situation is the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war and the liquidation of weapons of mass destruction. There is also a third view, the essence of which is that regional conflicts do not, allegedly, particularly influence Soviet-U.S. relations and the entire world situation. I do not know in what way the working group meetings discussed all these problems. There was no relevant reporting in the press. We have invited Soviet and U.S. scientists to take part in a television discussion on these issues. First of all, I would like to give the floor to our U.S. guests; Harold Saunders, I think you will begin our discussion.

[Saunders] Thank you very much for inviting us here. From the very beginning I would like to throw light on the importance of discussing issues such as Afghanistan and the Near East since, in my understanding, we ourselves need to discuss these matters thoroughly, to find out in depth, what, in fact, are the vital interests of each of our countries in a particular region. You understand that we are discussing these issues not only academically, because it is essential to understand how -- in what ways and forms -- the competition between us in real world is conducted and not merely in the scientific world. Thus, for instance, we can go along parallel routes in solving the Arab-Israeli conflict and, through clarifying these routes, we can begin to understand better the stakes, the risks of each side, at every turn of events in this particular region.

Using this information, we will be able to understand and define for ourselves how we can avoid a crisis between us, just as by parallel means we can find a solution to these problems, and possibly even somehow establish cooperation on these problems, albeit working cooperation, with the aim, if not of resolving, then of alleviating conflicts in hotspots of the planet. We therefore view our discussion as a kind of laboratory, so that we might have a deeper understanding of how we can, jointly or in parallel, resolve worldwide problems.

[Primakov] I would like to add a few words to what Harold Saunders has said. First of all I would like to respond to those issues set before us by our master of this round table, Farid Seyful-Mulyukov. I think that it would not be correct to counterpose the issues of disarmament and regional conflicts. The thing is that, in fact, the path to disarmament, the path to arms reduction, including, naturally, profound reductions in the arms race and so on, is a main road on the way to improving the international situation. This is all a main road, because if this road is not going to exist, then there will simply be no humankind. At the same time, conflicts also exist, and both their existence and their development affect stability in the international situation -- they undermine stability, and the conflicts turn into detonators which, in the conditions of the arms race, could burn up the international situation, blow up the world.

It seems to me, therefore, that those who say — and we have heard these voices in the United States in our time — that first, they say, comes trust, first, they say, let's come to an agreement on eliminating conflict situations, and after that, they say, let's get down to questions of disarmament, are incorrect. It seems to me that this kind of arrangement is unacceptable. But it does not follow that there should be any belittling of the importance of the work on eliminating conflict situations.

And now a rejoinder, just on what Harold Saunders said. We are indeed interested in not being drawn into certain situations, in avoiding the possiblity of clashing with one another that is one of the aims facing us. But at the same time, I would not restrict myself to the examination of a conflict situation on precisely this aspect. Indeed, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed, as one of the elements in the new political way of thinking, the need that the Soviet Union still has, namely the need not to view conflict situations only through the prism of Soviet-American relations.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] You wanted to add something, please go ahead.

[Stewart] Yes, I do want to add a few words. I thank you for giving me the floor. I think that in evaluating the questions, and when we respond to the questions posed by the moderator on the relationship between disarmament and regional conflicts it would be useful to try to understand the approaches of the American public, and American public opinion, to all these issues. You see, the American attitude to the Soviet Union is based on two fears, or sources of fear. The first is fear of nuclear war — nuclear catastrophe is indisputably a fear that has taken deep root, and it unites our sides. Moreover, nevertheless, there in another fear — fear of Soviet might, of Soviet strength, of Soviet expansionism and of their being used for real . In recent years this fear has somewhat lessened, but nevertheless it remains an evident factor on the international scene. Regional conflicts are the most clear-cut manifestations of this fact. In the development of regional conflicts we can see direct evidence, direct and graphic manifestation of Soviet intentions, we define the degree to which is far from denying what Primakov said on the importance of local factors in regional conflicts. I would just like to stress that the role played by both sides in the course of these conflicts to a certain extent forms our overall attitude, our point of view, now this influences the relationship between disarmament and regional conflicts. First of all, I would agree that the real policy of the United States is one that does not counterpose the settlement of regional conflicts, as some kind of force working against disarmament. We have been implementing both these processes in parallel over the course of many years. I would particularly like to note, first of all, that tangible steps that could lead to progress, to a solution of these long-standing crises, are what are now needed. First of all such steps are needed in Afghanistan and the regions adjacent to it. If they take place, it will help to a significant extent diminish fear regarding Soviet intentions throughout the world, and correspondingly strengthen public support for those difficult choices we simply have to make in the world in which we live, and in which nuclear weapons play, if not an even-increasing role, then a constantly prominent one.

Precisely because of this, regional conflicts hold a special place. They are a kind of pointer, an indicator, of the real intentions of each side. And it is in precisely this sense that we are holding our discussions. Here, in precisely this sense, I regard our discussions as encouraging, in the sense that we are beginning to understand with increasing clarity how each side approaches the questions that divide us today.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] You have painted quite an impressive picture of the U.S. public's fear of Soviet might and Soviet exapnsionism. I think Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov will reply to this question.

[Kislov] Strictly speaking it isn't even a question, just a point of view. But I would like to dwell on this point of view, and look at it from a slightly different angle. Yes, indeed, conflicts exist. I am convinced of that. The majority of these conflicts have, as it were, deep national, religious, economic, historical, and other roots. But, of course, at the same time, if one looks at things in depth, one cannot deny that behind practically all the regional conflicts in the world today stands the legacy of either the old colonial system, which carved the world up, chopped into two, or into several pieces, nationalities, ethnic groups, and tribes, leaving them on opposite sides of borders, imposed differences between different ethnic groups, countries, and nations by pursuing the old policy of divide-and-rule, which dates back to ancient Rome.

To be absolutely frank, and in my view the point of our meetings and discussions is that we can speak absolutely frankly, trying to get as close as possible to the truth and to a better understanding of each other's positions and views, on the whole I am deeply convinced that the policy of the United States stands behind many of the conflicts in the modern world. However unpleasant it may be for our U.S. colleagues to hear it, I am deeply convinced of this, and I consider it necessary to repeat it.

We talk a lot these days about new thinking. I think that this meeting of ours to some extent already reflects this approach to the need to look in a new way at many factors that would previously have seemed perfectly clear to us. In saying this, I don't mean that the United States and the Soviet Union can resolve all conflicts, or, as it were, resolve at least the question of settling all, or most, of the conflicts. Of course not. We cannot impose our own will upon peoples, and if even if we try to do so, it will mean imposing our will upon somebody, and such a settlement will not be lasting or firm. But undoubtedly, if we act together, we would be able to create conditions more favorable for settling conflicts.

At times we have come very close to understanding what must be done to resolve a particular conflict. But unfortunately no tangible steps have flowed from our understanding.

We can talk a lot about Afghanistan, for instance. You raised the question of what is going on in Afghanistan. The USSR withdraws six regiments, and the U.S. Government announces the delivery of ground-to-air missiles.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Excuse me, I think that Robert Naumann wants to come into the discussion. Please.

[Naumann] Thank you very much. I would simply like to confine myself to a simple statement, that I cannot acccept the picture that has been drawn here, that allegedly the United States is responsible for the majority of these conflicts. As far as time permits, let us get down to the essence of the matter. However, at the moment I do not wish to go into detail, but simply to make the following observation. Conflicts do not arise solely and exclusively from a policy of some kind of intentions and cultivation by the main powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States. They are regional conflicts because they arise from the very core of other, smaller, often subordinate states. We can judge only according to the amount of information that we posess what regions they might arise in, and if one is to generalize, I think that regional conflict is the most dangerous of all the dangerous factors now existing on the international scene. Thank you.

[Primakov] I would also like to speak. We should be equal in having the chance of agreeing or not agreeing with what each of us has to say.

I also categorically do not agree with Phil Stewart in that, first, there is allegedly a build-up of Soviet might taking place, or that the threat of alleged Soviet expansionism is a reason, so to speak, for the mistrust he speaks of, and even a reason for the development of some kind of conflicts.

[Seyjul-Mulyukov] And the fear of the American public?

[Primakov] The fear exists, but they are whipping up this fear. Public opinion is being manipulated, and we know frequently how they do it, Phil. Recently, for example, when Kalb resigned — that is the deputy press officer at the State Department — when he resigned it emerged why he resigned. Because through him the State Department was misinforming the American press, saying that Libya had allegedly prepared and carried out specific acts of terrorism. So this is how they manipulate public opinion and create it. So I don't think it is worth talking about fear of the Soviet Union in detail now, we don't have the time. You and we are all serious people, we understand that the Soviet Union is not interested in building up any kind of conflict situations. That's one thing.

The second aspect. You say that the most important issue to you is Afghanistan, and that it is precisely here that the Soviet Union should demonstrate what it is capable of. But I do not accept this point of view. I can say that for us there are very many conflict situations that we won't go into here that are for us very important; and even more important not strictly for us, but from the point of view of the stability or instability of the international situation. Take Central America, for example. Take the U.S. threat in Nicaragua. There's a legitimate government in place, which has, incidentally, armed its people — and there's no government that is not supported by the people that is going to arms its people, that's perfectly clear — and they are trying to overthrow it. I don't want, so to speak, to create any aggravation now, you're challenging me to do that. I simply would like to ask that we move on to some kind of specific core and examine specifically some situations. We would like, for example, to look at the Near East and also Afghanistan.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Let's take the Near East, as Harold Saunders, I think, wants to speak on this topic.

[Saunders] Well, first I would like to say that in the traditions of the Dartmouth discussions we do, as a rule, allow ourselves to move beyond the limits of mutual accusations and apportioning responsibility for one conflict or another. You see, our discussions are essentially of an analytical nature, that is, in any event, what normally happens, as distinct from the start of this current discussion between us. We try to look at what lies beneath the surface of one conflict or another. I'll now move on to the Near East, but for a moment I'd like as a simple commentary to say that the analytical basis that is traditionally adopted for the Dartmouth discussions does not require pronouncements of the type that one side is manipulating public opinion, but consists of recognizing the real fact, the basic, key fact, of the realities of the modern world. Our actions in Nicaragua, yours in Afghanistan make their own contribution to one public understanding or another of our intentions in one region or another, and while that is true of the modern world, our aim in these talks is to understand how the actions of one side are received by the official circles and the public of the other side, and to try to make this understood in a simple, undistorted and unmanipulated way.

Now, as far as the Arab-Israeli conflict is concerned, this happens to be a very good example of a regional conflict on which, as far as I recall, over almost a 20-year period now, starting from the 1967 war, the view of the United States has continually moved forward to a more perfect understanding of how American policy is perceived in the Soviet milieu. I find myself that I am much more prepared now than ever before to accept the view of Academician Primakov that the Soviet Union is interested in moving the Arab-Israeli conflict forward to the stage of settlement, to the stage of resolution. In the United States there are a fairly large number of people who think that the Soviet Union's interest lies in prolonging tention in this region and I personally do not accept this view, but there are wide circles that think that the Soviet Union is reaping the fruits of the prolonged contradiction and tension.

So what is essential for us is for each side to find its own means of demonstrating convincingly that the side we represent is ready to pay the known price in the currency of its own political capital in order to move forward the situation in the Near East to productive discussions, if not to a final settlement. Thus this forum provides us with an excellent analytical opportunity to discuss the measures that we could adopt to put an end to the tension in the Near East and to understand what paths to follow, what kind of talks to set up for the resolution of this conflict. Moreover, if the world public is to see, both on our part and on your part, a real desire to work for a solution to this conflict, then public opinion on both sides — the misunderstanding or lack of understanding of real events o both sides will be considerably reduced, thus promoting the achievement of the aims of these talks.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Are you going to set out the Soviet position on a settlement of the conflict?

[Primakov] No, I just agree completely with Harold Saunders, that we need to think about some kind of constructive steps that could lead to settlement in the Near East. I am absolutely sure that we want that. That is precisely why the Soviet Union is proposing that a conference be held for a general settlement.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] An international conference.

[Primakov] Yes. There was, at one time, as they say, the Camp David agreement. And it was implemented, in an official capacity, by Bob Naumann, the very same, who took part in that process, serving under the administration of that time.

It is perfectly clear that, on the whole, the United States had already tried to make some sort of contribution. From our point of view, it was not a constructive contribution. We have plenty of proof of this: For example, after it, the separate agreement the United States was trying to impose in the Lebanon, was broken off. There was no further proposal, and no settlement of the Near East conflict came about. On the contrary, we then saw the annexation of the Golan Heights by the Israeli side following Camp David, and then the whole of Jerusalem was declared the capital...

[Seyful-Mulyukov — interrupting] The sole and indivisible capital of Israel.

[Primakov] Yes, and incidentally, the United States will not accept this viewpoint officialy either.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] And there was the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

[Primakov] That is exactly what I was going to say. There was also the invasion of the Lebanon. So it didn't work. There is another form of movement toward peace. That is a movement toward a general settlement, of course, with the participation of both the United States and the Soviet Union. But (?Harold) knows full well that the Kissinger school and that of the others who took over from him professed the view that the Soviet Union should be isolated from the process of a political settlement. In such conditions, of course, a political settlement in the Near East is inconceivable, just as it was without the United States, in fact. And now we have an idea.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Excuse me, if you would, Yevgeniy Maksimovich. I wanted to put in here that the main thing is that one cannot shut out all the interested parties from such a settlement in the Near East.

[Primakov] Yes, that is a correct formulation of the question, and that is just what I wanted to move on to. At present, for example, we are proposing a general conference. Furthermore, we are proposing that some preliminary work be done to prepare for the conference, convening a preparatory conference first, for example, at the level of permanent representatives at the Security Council. Then, there must be mandatory participation in the conference by all, including the PLO naturally, which represents the Palestinian people. You realize, that without this, it can lead to nothing.

But unfortunately, there is no progress. And here, I'm sorry Phil, it is not a matter of Soviet military might. The fact is, that progress is being held up chiefly by the Reagan administration. I'm ready to argue this point. Let's hear your point of view.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] I believe Robert Naumann wants to enter the discussion.

[Naumann] I fear that our vast television audience will not receive its due of good heart and optimism if we continue accusing each other of heinous mutual crimes. [laughter] Let us consider these over and done with. Nothing can be done about the past, you understand, any more than you can force the toothpaste back into the tube. And I hope that our moderator will guide us with a firmer hand, and lead us through the channel, through the maze of our regional discussions before our time runs out.

[Kislov] That seems to me a very interesting and timely remark that Robert Naumann has just made. I am also convinced that to unblock conflict situations in the world collective efforts are required by all states either participating to any extent in the conflicts or able to exert any influence on their deterioration, or, on the other hand, on a settlement of them. It is precisely in the collective nature of the efforts that the guarantee of success lies. Indeed, the efforts of even many states can be wrecked by the stance of just one side. Just like in family life: you need the desire of at least two parties in order to live well. Just one party can wreck the happiness of the family.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Or a third party. [laughter]

[Kislov] It seems to me that this is precisely why those ideas and those proposals that concern the convocation of an international conference on the Near East and the preparation of this conference by means of talks within the framework of a preparatory conference in which the five permanent members of the Security Council could take part are ideas that are a very, very serious and sound foundation for successful progress toward a settlement of the Near East conflict.

I think that our discussions will still lead to our positions on this issue becoming closer and that we will succeed in influencing both American public opinion and the public opinion in many other countries — and Soviet public in this respect hardly needs any strong influence because in our country, as far as I know, the people are very concerned at the continuing tense situation in the Near East and would very much like real breakthroughs toward settlement of this conflict.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Harold Saunders, you want, in my view, to speak.

[Saunders] Let me just make one more quick comment about the Arab-Israeli conflict, and then let's move on to Afghanistan. I've got the impression that there are, so to speak, two factors that should be considered of paramount importance in examining the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Soviet side regards as paramount the need for international participation and international preparation for an international conference. But from the point of view of the preparation for such a conference, I would stress not just the technical aspect of this preparation, but also the political side. You understand, it is essential when moving into the future to have a clear understanding of what the obstacles impeding productive talks are, what specifically each of the sides can do to remove these obstacles from our path.

A similar problem exists in Afghanistan, too. We have held talks under the aegis of the United Nations Organization with the aim of working out some tangible aspects of an international accord that would permit the Soviet Union to put into practice its desire to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. That is, it is essential that international talks take place in the most broad, complex and multinational context.

There is also a second factor in this picture, which is no less significant, and that is that the political process should be conducted in such a way as to be 100 percent directed toward the attainment of some kind of specific aim set by the international talks. Well, let's say, as far as a settlement in Afghanistan is concerned, the political process requires that we think about international approaches, about the international context, and on the other hand about what should happen on the domestic level in Afghanistan so that the Soviet troops can be withdrawn and so that a settlement acceptable for the opposing forces can be attained.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] We can say about the Near East that the conflict itself has lasted for some 30 years. I think that Harold Saunders has now involved us in a discussion of the situation around Afghanistan. I'll hand over to Vikto Grigoryevich Korgun, who has not yet managed to speak, and our time is coming to an end.

[Korgun] Thank you. Over recent days our discussion have demonstrated that Afganistan is truly a very complex problem, a problem that is complex both on the international level and on the level of the development of the domestic situation. However, I do not just think, I am convinced and believe that this is far from a hopeless problem. I can see a possibility — and my colleagues will support me in this — a possibility of resolving this problem in the near future.

On the one hand, a situation in many respects favorable for this is taking shape around Afghanistan, in the international context; and on the other hand, it is possible to observe a number of important processes unfolding within the country, processes that make it possible for us to speak of the establishment of favorable conditions for the process of stabilization, political stabilization above all.

Without doubt, one cannot deny that Afghanistan is now experiencing very difficult times: a prolonged war, economic difficulties, schools, mosques, and lines of communication in ruins. And this is not surprising. The progress of the Afghan people along the road of social progress is complicated by a great number of objective and subjective factors, many of which were inherited from by the present authorities from the previous antipeople regimes: economic backwardness, exceptional backwardness; the underdeveloped nature of the social structure of Afghan society; universal illiteracy; the influence of traditional factors — a restraining influence, a braking influence; the presence of national, religious and other contradictions in Afghan society; the difficulty of transforming it, of bringing it on, in essence, from the middle ages into the nuclear age; and finally a factor which is not last in importance — that of external interference, which has taken the form of a long-term, large-scale, undeclared war against a people who are waging a difficult struggle for their radiant future.

Nor do I wish to conceal from you difficulties of a subjective nature. The party heading this movement, the movement of its people along the path of social progress, is a young one. As yet it has little experience in running society and guiding its people. The party is in fact taking only its first steps on this path. An empirical quest is under way, a quest that is naturally accompanied by certain costs, as we say in the first stage of the revolution.

However, the time that has elapsed since the revolution gives us an opportunity to take a more sanguine view of the processes now beginning to develop in Afghanistan. In recent years, taking account of the mistakes of the previous leadership, the present government has developed a new and more flexible course in its social and political policy, a course already giving positive results, testifying to the creation of a new social climate in the country. First of all, we are dealing with a campaign unleashed on a national scale to expand the sociopolitical base of the regime, and of the April Revolution itself. The essence of this campaign lies in involving the most varied social strata of the Afghan people not only in participation in sociopolitical life, but also in the direct running of the state.

With the coming to power of the new party leadership in Afghanistan, the quest for dialogue, the quest for opportunities for cooperation with various political groups and forces, both in Afghanistan itself and in emigration beyond its borders, has substantially gained in strength. Very recently, Najibullah, the leader of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA], speaking at the end of October this year, where about 100 journalists from various countries of the world were gathered...

[Seyful-Mulyukov -- interrupting] I was among the journalists at the time.

[Korgun] Najibullah plainly stated that Afghanistan now stands for the creation of a government of national unity, which can include representatives of any political parties or groupings prepared to uphold the laws of the DRA and cooperate with the regime in the name of achieving peace in Afghanistan.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Excuse me, Viktor Grigoryevich. In my opinion, you have fairly extensively set out the situation regarding a settlement. Robert Naumann, a former U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan, would like to enter this discussion. Do go ahead.

[Naumann] Thank you, I find myself somewhat optimistic as to the possibility of a settlement to the conflict in Afghanistan. But I am obliged to inform our audience that just as it once haunted Europe, at present a spectre is now haunting the tormented continent of Soviet-American relations. That spectre is Afghanistan.

The shock, the blow we felt in the United States from the invasion of that country by Soviet troops has not yet died away. It has not yet been overcome.

And, all the same, I am trying to view this question with a dispassionate eye. Having stood aside, I am trying to understand why this is happening the way it is -- not a shock, not an upheaval, but why is it that Afghanistan has become such an enormous problem. After all, it is an area of the world which, by virtue of its geographical position should also be close to the USSR in the essence.

When I was ambassador in Afghanistan, I fully accepted for myself this fact and I accept it now, too, namely that no matter what is said, no matter what is done, Afghanistan should maintain close and permanent relations with the USSR. We in the United States acknowledge and accept this fact. How, then, have we turned out to be in such an impasse -- because I remember these days very well indeed, the days of the closest possible cooperation between our Soviet colleagues and my own personnel, my staff, including me myself.

It only remains for me to feel regret that an opportunity for detente even prior to detente was let slip and this creates a tragic feeling. I witnessed the sudden seizure of power during the military coup that did not have the extensive support of the people, since it lacked barricades, an uprising, demonstrations, all that we usually link with a universal popular uprising. It is said to me that it is our intervention that is responsible for the situation that has taken shape. I want to emphasize that our aide to the freedom fighters in Afghanistan only commenced much later, after the April 1978 events; it began only after the Soviet invasion, after the Soviet troops were brought to Afghanistan. But even then, as today, our aid does not play the chief part. It is the Afghans themselves who should be the main actors on that stage, the chief figures on that arena.

We will not succeed in substituting ourselves for them during talks. Afghans are a proud people, a nation of proud people. They will accept national reconciliation only as a reconciliation between equals and not as a process involving personalities of one kind or another -- proud personalities, I repeat -- in the structure that has been created for them. No one will succeed in implementing this.

You see, the goal of any new political bodies -- governments or any other kind of bodies whatever -- consists in accomplishing two things. The first is to create sufficient stimulus for the fighters for freedom in Afghanistan to lay down their arms. No one will succeed in doing this from the sidelines. Afghans are a people cast in a completely different mold -- they will not allow this to happen.

Apart from that, it is necessary to spare a thought about how to put a stop to the sufferings and how to safely return approximately 4 million Afghans to the motherland -- a third of the population, currently living a life of misery abroad. This, likewise, will not be possible to attain, by us, or by you, or by any other third power whatever -- only by the Afghans themselves.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Yevgeniy Maksimovich wishes to say a few words.

[Primakov] Well, here one can, of course, provide, as it were, polemical asnswers to each of Bob's statements. However, I would simply like to say, to begin with, with regard to the revolution: Do believe us that we know what revolution is and our knowledge is not smaller than the knowledge about this in the United States. And we know how a revolution is done and whether the barricades are there or not, it is not an indicator of whether a revolution exists or not.

As for the structures that have been created for the Afghan people, of course I cannot agree with this, if only because well, you say that the United States began to help the so-called freedom fighters, as you call them — we call them bandits and we have grounds to regard them as bandits. We do have grounds for this, because we see what they are doing. But, you say that the United States began to help only after the Soviet contingent entered there — that is a question. But the fact that our contingent entered there not during the very beginning of the revolution, so as to create this structure, something that you are alluding to, but after that, when the necessity for this arose as a result of interference from outside and when the relevant request came through — well, this is a fact that no one can dispute.

And now I wish to say something about the chief issue. In our discussion we always touch on this question and you ask us the question, well, when will the USSR withdraw its contingent from Afghanistan? The beginning is happening and our interviewer here, or the presenter of our broadcast, he himself has recently just arrived from there, as far as I know.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] I was there during the withdrawal of our six regiments and there were American journalists there, filming it all, both in Kabul and in other towns.

[Primakov] But the point is not only in numbers, for this operation has major political significance. But I want to say something about another thing. Well, believe me, there are two possibilities, real possibilities. As far as I understand, what we want is to withdraw our contingent from Afghanistan as quickly as possible, if appropriate guarantees are received against interference from outside. There is also a second possibility: When we are there and conditions become more and more stable, the situation becomes more and more stable — and there is a tendency toward this — and stabilization will take place even without it, so to speak, without guarantees against interference from outside — and we will leave all the same. [sentence as heard] But this leaving will take place later and this is what we do not want, we want to do this earlier.

Now, how to do it earlier, that's the question. Well, Americans are often fond of saying that we need many ifs, as the Americans say. Thus: we want many ifs. Well, if the supply of assistance to these bandits is halted, if a halt is put now to the supply to them of the most up-to-date arms they use against aviation, if indeed conditions are created so that there is no action directed against Afghanistan from Pakistani territory — and things are moving in this direction, isn't that so — if a formula for national reconciliation is found, something everyone is talking about — and that, too, is very important, you understand — well, all these ifs taken together will amount to the construction of an edifice that will create certain guarantees and I think that then nothing more will be needed. We will then simply find a common language with the Afghans. As a matter of fact, we even have a schedule for the withdrawal.

[Seyful-Mulyukov — interrupting] An agreed upon, stage-by-stage withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan...

[Primakov — interrupting] With the Afghans [words indistinct] we do have an accord with the Afghans. But this must be implemented, and the ifs too, these many ifs.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Yes. Robert Naumann, please go ahead.

[Naumann] I have a very brief statement to make, in reply to what has just been said by my friend Yevgeniy and with which I am in full agreement. However, it is not victory in a discussion, but the attainment of results that is the goal of diplomacy. And the results are attainable only if we succeed in making all these factors compatible and hold talks on them as a package. I do not say simultaneously. Say one factor has been resolved, so it is removed. The troop withdrawal is essential. The creation of guarantees is essential. It is senseless to say: you should be first to withdraw the troops and only then will we undertake measures of one kind or another in response. It is senseless to say to the Soviet side: First you should put a halt to giving aid to the bandits, for no one will do this. All this is surrounded by conditions which must be solved jointly. However, the whole complexity of these conditions notwithstanding, if there is resolve to commence specific actions, we will succeed in resolving them.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Well, here we apparently have to sign off. Our time on the air is drawing to an end. During the course of this television discussion among Soviet and American specialists on the problems of regional conflicts most various and, at times, polarized viewpoints were voiced and this is not surprising. I think that our television viewers are sufficiently well informed and prepared to draw their own judgement on the problems touched on during this television broadcast. One would like to hope that American television viewers, too, will see our television discussion. In conclusion: thank you to all the participants in our broadcast. Good-bye.

PRAVDA REVIEWS CEMA MEETINGS, U.S. ACTIVITIES

PM181635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[Boris Kotov "International Review"]

[Text] Entering the 70th Year [subhead]

History is ticking away the first days of the 70th year of the new era which began with Great October. Our country entered its jubilee year mightier and more prosperous, rejuvenated and revitalized. The line of the Central Committee April Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress is being consistently implemented. A major turnabout in Soviet society's development and a restructuring of a revolutionary nature are gathering pace. It is no accident that L'HUMANITE, the newspaper of the French Communists, noted in its 7 November issue: "The Soviet Union has not lost its role of trailblazer."

More than 1.5 billion people have chosen the socialist path of development. The peoples of the socialist community states march in the vanguard of builders of the new life. They share common goals and basically identical tasks concerning the acceleration of socioeconomic development, the enhancement of working people's well-being, and the struggle for peace and universal security. This is why mutual exchange of specific experience and coordinated actions in the foreign policy sphere acquire particular importance for these countries. The meetings of leaders of the community states' ruling parties have been an important aspect of this activity.

This work required a broader scope and greater intensity following the 27th CPSU Congress. The latest evidence of this was provided by the 10-11 November Moscow meeting of leaders of fraternal parties from CEMA's socialist countries: Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia.

It was noted at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo's 13 November session that the CPSU positions outlined at the meeting are a practical expression of the line of intensifying the interaction of ruling communist and workers parties, the line of priority development of relations with socialist countries and the consolidation of world socialism.

The Moscow meeting discussed fundamental problems of the development and improvement of cooperation between socialist community countries and opportunities to reveal more fully socialism's creative potential. It was for this purpose that "particular attention was given to the further deepening of relations in the economic sphere and the utilization of new and most advanced forms of eoncomic, scientific, and technical interaction."

What lies behind these laconic words of the report on the Moscow meeting can be perceived in particular from the results of the scheduled 42nd sitting of the CEMA Session, held in Bucharest 3-5 November. It was decided there that one of the most important tasks is to develop widely such progressive forms of cooperation as direct business links and the establishment of joint enterprises, associations, and organizations operating on the basis of financial autonomy. A major practical step in this direction was taken by the signing of bilateral agreements between economic organizations of the USSR and of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, and the CSSR at head-of-government level during the session's work.

The Moscow meeting of leaders of the CEMA socialist countries' fraternal parties generated a broad international response. The Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, for example, notes in particular that the meeting participants supported the Soviet Union's principled stance in Reykjavik and emphasized the need to build up joint efforts in the interests of the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons and reduce conventional arms, to strengthen peace and international security.

A Principled Line [subhead]

The strengthening of good-neighborliness and cooperation in the international arena is the principle and immutable line of the CPSU and the Soviet state. It also applies fully to our relations with states with different sociopolitical systems.

It was announced this week that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will pay an official friendly visit to India at the end of November at the invitation of Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi and the Indian Government. The forthcoming visit is a manifestation of the close and friendly relations existing between the two countries and peoples and will make a further contribution to the tradition of Soviet-Indian summit meetings. Both sides attach enormous importance to this visit as a noteworthy event in bilateral relations and a major step in the implementation of tasks concerning the strengthening of international peace and cooperation that are common for our two states and their leaders.

Soviet-Finnish relations also provide an example of how peaceful cooperation can and must be built between countries with different social systems. Developing on the firm foundation of the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between our two countries, these relations have a favorable effect on the improvement of the political climate in northern Europe and on the European Continent.

A CPSU delegation headed by Ye. K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has been in Finland in the last few days at the invitation of the Finnish Social Democratic Party [SSDP]. The most topical problems of the international situation and the workers movement and the prospects for Soviet-Finnish relations were discussed in the course of talks held with a SSDP delegation. The delegations briefed each other on their parties' activities and affirmed their reciprocal desire to continue to develop ties between the CPSU and the SSDP in the interest of strengthening friendly relations between our countries and of the struggle against the nuclear threat and for peace and security.

Speaking at a press conference in Helsinki 13 November, the head of the Soviet delegation dwelt on the question of consolidating security and stability in northern Europe. Having reminded those present that our country actively supports the proposal to create a nuclear-free north, he announced that, by way of augmenting and developing its position, the USSR has deemed it possible to take a number of new, specific, and weighty steps aimed at consolidating peaceful conditions in Europe's northern region. These steps include the already implemented dismantling of launch installations for medium-range missiles on the Kola Peninsula and of the majority of launch installations for such missiles in the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic Military Districts, and the redeployment away from these districts of several divsions of operational-tactical missiles. It is also a question of the USSR's readiness -- provided agreement to allocate nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea is reached between the states concerned — to withdraw submarines armed with ballistic missiles from the Soviet Baltic Fleet. The USSR has further proposed to embark on limiting the intensity of major military exercises in norther Europe and its contiguous seas.

The world's news agencies, which immediately spread this important news, are now reporting numerous responses to it. Positive assessment of the USSR's new peace initiatives predominates in them. They are justly preceived by broad circles of the world public as a new demonstration of our country's good will and its desire to make a specific contribution to stengthening peace by means of practical deeds.

The results of the CPSU delegation's visit to Finland graphically demonstrate how fruitful contacts between peoples can be if they are based on such democratic principles as reciprocal respect for sovereignty and independence, noninterference in one another's internal affairs, equality, and honest partnership. This is particularly important at a time when the United States is not only ceasing but actually intensifying its attacks against these principles, against trust and cooperation in international relations.

Reykjavik: Two Approaches [subhead]

A striking example of how the U.S. Administration tramples the principles of civilized interstate contacts and honest partnership in international affairs is provided by its position of retreating from Soviet-U.S. accords on nuclear disarmament questions, a position which is dangerous for the fate of mankind. The month that has passed since the Reykjavik summit meeting has thrown a particularly strong light on this unseemly picture.

All this time, the dilligent efforts by official Washington and its subservient propaganda machine in the West have released upon the world wave after wave of political speculations, of biased or even downright dishonest interpretations of the course and results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Iceland. Mountains of lies and disinformation have been heaped up — from attempts by the White House to "expropriate" the Soviet initiatives paving the way to a nuclear-free world right up to screams of delight about the USSR's "pliancy" only when faced with the U.S. "position of strength." [paragraph continues]

As if to confirm this, Washington announced the deployment of the new MX ICBM's at combat stations and the U.S. intention to exceed even before the end of this year the nuclear arms level set by the SALT II Treaty.

These steps were criticized even in the U.S. Senate. "It would be laughable if," Senator R. Byrd declared, for example, "only a month after Reykjavik, we were to make a 180-degree turn and offer to increase the number of strategic weapons." There is, however, very little to laugh about here. All this evidently became necessary in order to poison Soviet-U.S. relations, to attempt to revise the results of Reykjavik, and to deprive the peoples of the newly emerged hope. One gets the impression that, having overcome their temporary embarrassment, the U.S. military-industrial complex bosses, the nuclear manufacturers, and their helpers in the military departments ("The shock of Reykjavik," Britain's THE DAILY TELEGRAPH remarked, "shook even the Pentagon diehards") have decided to exact their revenge. They are making all-out efforts to tighten the militarist reins and force the "makers" of U.S. policy to turn back, abandoning to the mercy of fate the interests of their own people, of U.S. national security, and of universal peace.

The U.S. side's desire to wreck the accords reached in Reykjavik and to retreat to its pre-Reykjavik positions also took a practical, material form in the last few days. At the 5-6 November talks in Vienna with the USSR foreign minister, the U.S. secretary of state staged a show, as it was mildly put, of veritable political theater of the absurd. He put on the table before his interlocutor an amazing collection of papers, essentially negating everything the sides achieved in Reykjavik.

The most striking part of all this was the fact that the global solution found in Iceland to the central problem — the liquidation of all USSR and U.S. nuclear arsenals, and primarily of strategic offensive weapons, over a 10-year period -- was purely and simply disclaimed.

Thus, Vienna saw the clash of two concepts, of two diametrically opposed approaches, E.A. Shevardnadze noted at his 10 November press conference. The Soviet Union desired to create a basis for practical implementation of the accords reached in Reykjavik. The United States attempted to establish positions leading to erosion of the Reykjavik soil.

This fact had a direct effect also on the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons being held in Geneva. Despite the new proposals based on the Reykjavik accords and submitted there by the USSR 7 November, the sixth round of these talks which ended a few days ago failed to produce any practical results.

Caught Red-Handed [subhead]

Today, following an analysis of the post-Reykjavik situation, one cannot avoid the obvious conclusion: The myth about the "Soviet military threat" which people across the ocean have used in attempts to justify the sinister scheme of the "defensive" militarization of space is collapsing before the eyes of the world. Now it ought to be clear even to people in the West who are stupefied by propaganda manipulation that no military threat can originate from a country which, as the Soviet Union did in Iceland, proves by deeds its compete readiness for nuclear disarmament, its readiness for compromise and substantial concessions. Subject, of course, to reciprocity.

The opposite also applies. It is evident to any sober-minded person that the real threat to peace and the peoples' security stems from the militarist circles in the United States, which dictate to this great power a policy imbued with the ossified terminology of imperial and hegemonist thinking. [paragraph continues]

This can be seen not just in Washington's obstructionist approach to nuclear disarmament problems. Evidence of it can also be seen in numerous events occurring in different parts of the world.

The U.S. Administration was caught red-handed and for the whole world to see in the act of committing crude interference in Iran's internal affairs, using secret arms shipments to fan the already protracted and bloody Iran-Iraq conflict. The world public follows anxiously the intensive imperialist fueling of tension around independent Syria, which is falsely accused of complicity with some terrorists.

U.S. imperialism was also caught red-handed in Nicaragua, after taking interference in its internal affairs to the brink of armed aggression. Evidence of this is provided in particular by the Managua trial of the pilot of a U.S. aircraft which was shot down while delivering arms to gangs of counterrevolutionaries. It is highly indicative that the OAS session in Guatemala condemned the aggressive U.S. policy in Central America.

Yes, the shoots of realism that appeared to break through on the U.S. side in the Reykjavik days are again being trampled into the soil by the boots of militarist ambitions. Could it possibly be that the present White House incumbents intend to be remembered only for their policy of confrontation, military conflicts, illusory striving for military superiority, and sabotage of the disarmament cause?

A new situation has developed in international relations now, in the wake of Reykjavik. The peoples have seen for themselves the real prospect of and practical opportunity for creating a nuclear-free world. They are convinced: There is no turning back. And the way ahead, as M.S. Gorbachev noted, lies through the new political thinking, through awareness of the realities of the contemporary diversity in a contradictory and interconnected world.

WORLD TU CONGRESS SENDS MESSAGE TO GORBACHEV

PM051201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Message of the 11th World Trade Union Congress to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee" — PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The 11th World Trade Union Congress was held in Berlin, the GDR capital, 16 through 22 September 1986 at a decisive and extremely dangerous moment in our history. The question consists in how events in the world will develop — either human reason will gain the upper hand and realism will triumph in the name of the working people's interests, or the world will slide toward nuclear catastrophe and the destruction of mankind. Also we cannot tolerate the situation whereby vast material and intellectual resources are expanded on the arms race. It is disgraceful that approximately 1 trillion dollars a year are spent on military purposes — more than the total income of the countries in which more than half our planet's population lives.

The congress is convinced that the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, which poses a direct threat to our planet's security and to life itself on earth, is today the chief obstacle to the balanced and comprehensive development of the world economy. It is rightly maintained that if mankind is not able to halt the arms race then the latter will destroy it.

Research by specialists indicates that ending the arms race will help to put an end to mass unemployment. This possibility must be taken into account against the background of the terrible growth in unemployment and underemployment from which many countries suffer.

The world trade union movement consistently strives for international agreements to halt and reverse the arms race. A specific proposal to conclude an agreement on a 10-percent cut in arms spending was advanced at the Second UN General Assembly Special Session in 1982. If that proposal had been adopted at that time, it would have been possible to secure considerable sums for profitable capital investments and to support international economic cooperation by increasing aid to developing countries and to millions of people who are today deprived of the means for a worthy existence.

The 11th World Trade Union Congress voices its resolute disagrement with any further escalation of the arms race and insistes that space be free of nuclear weapons, as the overwhelming majority of UN member states demands. What is needed to preserve security in the world is not the "Star Wars" strategy but the strategy of creating jobs, the strategy of combating poverty, and, as peace-loving forces throughout the world demand, the strategy of universal international security on the basis of friendship and cooperaton among all countries and peoples.

The 11th World Trade Union Congress supports all proposals by individual countries or groups of countries that make a contribution to the disarmament program. Therefore the congress welcomes the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on nuclear weapon tests and calls on the United States and other nuclear powers to follow this example. The Soviet proposals for the destruction of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 accord with the wishes of working people and the peoples. The congress fully supports these initiatives aimed at ending the arms race and at disarmament, as well as the proposals advanced by the Eighth Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Harare at the beginning of September 1986 and by the "Delhi Six" countries in their "Mexico Declaration" and other disarmament initiatives by various political forces and mass organizations.

On behalf of 296 million organized working people on all continents the congress, at which 432 trade union organizations from 147 countries are represented, believes that the United Nations and all its members, primarily the United States and the USSR, must without delay take measures to conclude international agreements on ending the arms race and all nuclear tests, on eliminating nuclear and other kinds of mass destruction weapons, and on redistributing the funds released as a result of disarmament measures towards accelerating socioeconomic development. Measures must be taken in all countries to switch military enterprises to the production of peaceful output.

The congress once again states its conviction that the strategy of peace and disarmament has now become the decisive constituent part of the strategy of international development in ensuring a better life for all mankind.

The 11th World Trade Union Congress urges you to pay attention to these acute international problems and to take into account the hopes and aspirations of working people throughout the world, who have openly demonstrated at all levels their nonacceptance of the arms race.

CONTROVERSY CONTINUES OVER U.S.-IRAN ARMS SALES

Reagan Denies Shultz To Resign

LD181153 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] President Reagan of the United States has said that is not planning new arms shipments to Iran. He made this statement on the background of the spreading political scandal connected with secret deliveries of American weapons and spare parts for military equipment to Iran. Mr Reagan refuted the rumors circulating in Washington as to the possible resignation of Secretary of State George Shultz who had expressed dissatisfaction with the failure to duly inform him of those transactions. [passage omitted] American arms shipments to Iran gave rise to indignation throughout the world because they are conducive to procrastinating the Iranian-Iraqi conflict.

NPR Disagreement Cited

LD190626 Moscow TASS in English 0622 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] Washington, November 19 (TASS) — As a token of protest against the White House's secret deals with Iran, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz intends to tender his resignation, the NPR radio network reported on Tuesday with reference to sources in the administration of President Reagan.

The radio network also reported that the President asked George Shultz to remain at his post until the scandal caused by the exposures of the deliveries of U.S. weapons to Tehran subsides.

Turkatenko Commentary

LD181424 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS — Follows commentary by TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

The White House has taken up all-round defence and is trying to beat back mounting attacks in connection with the exposure of its "contacts" with the Iranian "moderate" (from Washington's viewpoint) groupings and arms shipments to Iran. This is how the situation in which the U.S. Administration has found itself is characterised here.

They in Washington have apparently failed to hush up the scandalous affair. Moreover, there is ever new evidence confirming that the National Security Council made, by detour of congress and practically of the whole cabinet, purposeful efforts aimed at interference in Iran's home affairs and the Iran-Iraq war with the aim of keeping up its momentum. The "initiative" as regards the "contacts" and arms supplies to Iran was conceived and implemented jointly by Washington and Tel Aviv.

In trying to guard himself against criticism and indignation touched off in the Arab world and in other countries, as well as in the USA, President Reagan said on Monday that he did not intend to carry on arms shipments to Iran.

The journalists, who attended the press conference of Larry Speakes, White House deputy press secretary, held on the same day, could not help asking: What about the secret directive sealing the "initiative" vis-a-vis Iran? Could it be cancelled? Larry Speakes admitted that such a document really existed and was signed by the President on January 17, 1986. But Speakes said that nobody cancelled that document and it technically remained in force.

Israel, the client of the USA in the Middle East, which is banking on a continuation of the Iran-Iraq war, was in a hurry to help out the White House. The Israeli defence minister Yitzhak Rabin angrily rejected any assumption that Israel could supply Iran with weapons without Washington's approval. He said "Israel has never sold American arms or weapons containing American components without having received authorisation from the United States."

The impudence with which the White House acts in conflict with its own assurances about "strict neutrality" as regards the Iran-Iraq war, and is doing it even together with another state, has met with criticism even among the U.S. Administration.

OVCHINNIKOV ATTACKS WEINBERGER SUMMIT STRATEGY

PM181500 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Ovchinnikov "Rejoinder": "Primitive Formula"]

[Text] The Pentagon chief delivered a speech in New York on a subject which would appear to have more to do with the State Department than the Defense Department: How to conduct talks with the Soviet Union. The speaker began, according to custom, with an introduction. For some decades, he said, the Americans have witnessed how NOT [capitalized work printed in boldface] to conduct talks with Moscow. And then, in Reykjavik, the President taught everyone a lesson...

What is instructive about that lesson? In Weinberger's opinion, you must follow four rules in dealing with the Russians. First: exclude any idea of "moral equivalence." The most serious error is to believe that the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union can have "common hopes and aspirations."

The second rule embodies the cult of strength. The United States, the Pentagon chief states bluntly, must become strong before starting talks with the Soviet Union. Otherwise it can never achieve agreements which meet America's interests.

Weinberger's third rule recommends taking into account the fact that it is easier for Soviet leaders to adopt decisions in the course of talks. (If you remember the U.S. Administration's profound dependence on the military-industrial complex, here one can, perhaps, agree with Weinberger.)

Lastly, rule four: When conducting talks, take a long-term view. The Russians, he says, can plan their actions far in advance and regard that as an advantage. The Americans feel discouraged when talks drag on. Reagan, he says, only had to show implacability on the question of SDI for the public to start making a fuss about "lost opportunities" and "dangerous consequences." From all this Weinberger concludes: Patience and determination to restore U.S. military might — that is the key to successful talks with the USSR.

Those are the views of the head of the military department of the leading capitalist power. It is pointless to seek even a glimmer of a new way of thinking, even a hint of an awareness that security in the nuclear age can no longer be identified with force, that for the USSR and the United States security can only be mutual, and in global terms it can only be universal. Nor is there any sign of an awareness of the inescapable truth that for all the contradictions of the modern world, peoples and states have a common interest: to prevent nuclear catastrophe and deliver mankind from death.

Weinberger's "four rules" smack of primitive anticommunism from the arsenal of Truman, who at one time tried in vain to blackmail the Soviet Union with the American monopoly of atomic weapons. Indeed, history also teaches us that some people do not learn from history.

CANADA RESUMES SCIENTIFIC, CULTURAL CONTACTS

LD141450 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Ottawa November 14 TASS — The Canadian Government has decided to resume contacts with the Soviet Union in the field of science, education and culture, Joseph Clark, Canadian external affairs minister, told journalists in Toronto.

He recalled that the programme of exchanges and cooperation between the USSR and Canada in science, education and culture was unilaterally cancelled by the Canadian Government in December, 1979 in the hope to get a change in the USSR's stand in connection with the developments around Afghanistan.

"I think that clearly the cutting off of relations with the Soviet Union (in the afore-mentioned areas) did not have the effect that we sought," Clark said.

The statement by the Canadian external affairs minister is an added proof that the sanctions imposed against the Soviet Union by the ruling quarters of a number of NATO countries under pressure from Washington have suffered a fiasco and only caused definite damage to those countries' normal relations with the Soviet Union.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON BILATERAL TALKS WITH JAPAN

Gerasimov Briefs Press

LD181510 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — Regular consultations between the Foreign Ministries of the USSR and Japan at the level of deputy foreign ministers were held in Moscow on November 13-14, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry today.

The Soviet side was represented at the consultations by Mikhail Kapitsa, the Japanese side — by Shin'ichi Yanai.

Shin'ichi Yanai was received by Eduard Shevardnadze, foreign minister of the USSR.

The sides discussed international problems and also issues of mutual interest, Gerasimov said. The Soviet side stressed the importance of the interaction of all states in the interest of consolidating the foundations of international security.

They expressed the view that there existed ample opportunties for cooperation between the USSR and Japan in the context of the broad programme to promote peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region. The Soviet side confirmed the USSR's principled line for developing the relations of goodneighbourliness with Japan and underlined the importance of both sides' efforts in this direction.

The consultations passed in a tranquil and businesslike atmosphere under the angle of the quest for ways to upgrade Soviet-Japanese relations. Gerasimov said.

KYODO on Gorbachev Visit

OW150121 Tokyo KYODO in English 0100 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 15 KYODO — Japan's hope for Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to visit Japan in January has become almost impossible to materialize.

This was learned Friday night at the end of the Moscow talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Shinichi Yanai. During the sixth Japan-USSR regular consultations, Shevardnadze said Gorbachev is hopeful of visitng Japan, meeting Japanese people and talking with Japanese leaders. However, he said more time is necessary to decide on what the Japan visit should be, he told Yanai. Because the prospects for the Soviet-U.S. relations are not so clear, the Soviet Union could not say more at present about the Japan visit other than what Shevardnadze told Japanese Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari in New York in September, he said.

Gorbachev's diplomatic schedule for next year has not yet been finalized, Shevardnadze told Yanai, according to Japanese sources.

Since the Japanese side earlier considered that if Gorbachev visits Tokyo in January, Japan would have to start preparation for the event around this month, the latest Soviet reply in effect terminates any plan for a January visit.

Shevardnadze said the Soviet Union would not drop Gorbachev's Japan visit from his future diplomatic schedule in reply to Yanai's statement that Japan hoped to get a response on the matter as soon as possible, the Japanese sources said. After the meeting, Yanai said Japan has to wait and see the Soviet decision on the matter and declined to speculate further about Gorbachev's visit. Both sides also failed to progress in talks on the Japanese territorial claim over the four Soviet-held islands east of Hokkaido, which fell into Russian hands at the end of World War II, the sources said.

On the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik in October, Shevardnadze told Yanai that the Soviet Union puts the utmost importance on the results of the summit and would never retreat from the results achieved at Reykjavik. The Soviet foreign minister also told Yanai about Soviet concerns related to Japan's participation in the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) research project, the sources said.

INSTITUTE DIRECTOR ADDRESSES ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM

LD181816 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — The Asian-Pacific region is the most troubled area in the world. It is precisely there that most hotbeds of local and international conflicts are situated, director of the institute of the Far East of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Mikhail Titarenko said this addressing today an international scientific conference "international relations and topical problems of ensuring peace and security in the Far East". Even though the scopes of the militarization of the area are so far lower than in Europe, the pace of the militarization is dangerously stepped up. Problems of the Asian-Pacific region can no longer be viewed apart from the overall international situation in the world of today.

The Soviet Union's approach to matters of security in Asia is not governed by circumstantial considerations, Mikhail Titarenko said. This is a long-time and principled line which is dictated by the Soviet Union's interest in peaceful conditions for successful socialist construction.

We declare for he convocation of an Asian forum for joint quest of constructive solutions, Mikhail Titarenko said. This will make it possible to establish points of contact, to work out the common princples of conduct and concerted interests of states in the nuclear-space age. The holding of such a forum will be promoting detente in Asia. At the same time it is necessay to implement a range of measures in the military, political and economic spheres which would make it possible to enhance the confidence of every state in its security. Such measures of confidence must be implemented on a regional and subregional levels both on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

MOSCOW RALLY BACKS PYONGYANG YOUTH FESTIVAL BID

LD172237 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS — The Soviet young people back a proposal by the Union of the Socialist Working Youth of Korea on holding the 13th World Festival of Youth and Students in Pyongyang in the summer of 1989, said today Vladimir Aksenov, chairman of the USSR Committee of Youth Organizations, at a youth mass rally in Moscow. The holding of the world festival of young people on the Asian continent for the first time, he noted, would help draw new forces of youth and students into the festival movement and the campaign for turning the Asian and Pacific region into a zone of peace and cooperation.

PAPER CLAIMS SEOUL IGNORES DPRK OVERTURES

PM171123 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Nov 86 Second Edition p 5

[A. Golts "Rejoinder": "Too Much Crow Meat"]

[Text] Judging by reports from Seoul, the leaders of the South Korean regime are eating crow meat almost every day. No, not because they are starving. Although the country's foreign debt has topped the 40 billion dollar mark long ago, this has not affected the living standards of the ruling circles. Washington rewards its most loyal friends generously.

The crow has become part of their diet for another reason. According to a popular superstition in Korea, anyone who tastes crow meat completely loses his memory. And memory is only an impediment to those who rule in Seoul. How, let me ask you, can you keep stepping up the militarist psychosis in South Korea, how can you keep shouting at every opportunity about the "threat from the North," if you constantly remember the DPRK's many peace initiatives? And so eating crow meant is most appropriate. Having eaten this "game," if you can call it that, it is considered fair game to talk any sort of nonsense about the policy of people's Korea.

This is obviously what the author of the latest appeal to the regime's army has done. Going beyond the usual statements that "a sudden attack by North Korea is possible," the appeal claims that the DPRK has completed preparations for such an attack by "switching all its forces to the vicinity of the border." In making this claim they managed to "forget" that in its efforts to reduce tension in the Korean peninsula the DPRK Government has recently adopted a decision to dispatch 150,000 servicemen to work at key national economic projects and that entire units of the Korean People's Army have of late been withdrawn from the area bordering on the demilitarized zone.

But this is not the only thing that Seoul has chosen to forget. The address contains absurd claims that the DPRK is allegedly preparing a "chemical attack." The South Korean rulers prefer not to mention that it was the American who more than 30 years ago dropped toxins on Korea. They also prefer not to recall that quite recently, in April, Washington announced its decision to deploy binary chemical munitions in the southern part of the peninsula.

As you can see, the memory of the pillars of the South Korean regime is quite poor. "They have eaten too much crow meat," is what they say about such people in Korea.

COMPARISON ON SHEVARDNADZE-YANAI TALKS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 16 November in its Morning Edition on page 5 carries under the general heading "Conversations at the USSR Foreign Ministry" a report on a conversation which took place in Moscow between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Sinichi Yanai. This has ben compared with the Moscow TASS English Version report published in the 17 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page C 1. It is virtually identical with the exception of the following variations:

Paragraph three, line three reads in IZVESTIYA: ...All peoples. The solution of the most...(changing 'settlement' to 'solution')

Penultimate paragraph, line three reads: A radical turn towards better in Soviet-Japanese relations would serve the interests of both countries, the cause of peace and security in the Far East and in the Asian-Pacific region as a whole. (omitting: 'best,' changing 'Middle East' to 'Far East')

NEW TIMES INTERVIEWS DRA LEADER NAJIBULLAH

PM111145 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 44, 10 Nov 86 pp 12-14

[Interview with Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, by special correspondent Leonid Mironov: "Najibullah: Renewal in All Spheres of Life"]

[Text] [Question] Comrade Najibullah, eight and a half years have passed since the April revolution of 1978. How do you define the main content of the present situation in the country?

[Answer] By its nature and content the April revolution is national-democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist. It was carried out in pursuance of the national interests and the aspirations of the broad popular masses, in the name of the ideals for which Afghan patriots, progressive and democratic forces have struggled for many years.

A process of renewal is now taking place in all spheres of life — social, economic, political and cultural. The country is shaking off the fetters of feudalism, backwardness and ignorance. In the time since April 1978 the revolution has dealt a crushing blow to all forms of national and social oppression, to the feudal-bureaucratic regime that for centuries had doomed the people to a life of oppression and poverty.

Within a short period of time a state of a new type — a democratic republic — has been created on the ruins of backward feudal-bureaucratic Afghanistan, formerly ironically described by Western journalists as "a splinter of the Middle Ages wedged-in amongst the Hindu Kush Mountains." The young working class and the broad masses of the peasantry now form the political bases of our society, and their firm alliance guarantees the safeguarding of the interests of all the other patriotic-minded sections of the population.

I would formulate the top-priority tasks facing the party and the republic at present as follows: the defence of our independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; the strengthening of the gains of the April revolution; the ensurance of broad and active participation of all working people and the other patriotic forces in the national-democratic transformation; and making Afghanistan a developed, flourishing state.

The democratic republic's enemies — the imperialists, regional reactionaries and counterrevolutionaries — are not above openly lying and resorting to malicious fabrications. They try to ascribe to the April revolution intentions that it never had; they gloat over the errors made by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and allege that we are stagnating. We are revolutionaries and for this reason are not afraid to speak about our weaknesses, and we do everything we can to overcome them.

[Question] People from various provinces — workers, peasants, craftsmen and representatives of tribes — very often come to the afghan capital. Recently, I understand, you and other members of the Political Bureau of the PDPA CC have designated certain days on which you receive these people. What do you talk about with them?

[Answer] Not long ago I travelled to a number of provinces, visited many enterprises and addressed meetings. In short, I tried to have as much contact with people as possible. I also receive more than fifty people a month. To be closer to the masses — this is what we now demand of all PDPA officials. During our conversations with working people the most pressing issues and problems are dealt with. It also happens, of course, that people come with specific requests, which we do our best to fulfil. We must not isolate ourselves from the people, we must not hide from them in air-conditioned offices. People taken as a whole are wiser and more experienced than any leader. Therefore we must learn from them. All members of the Political Bureau of the PDPA CC take turns receiving the public at the Delkush palace every day. Incidentally, ordinary people used to be denied access to this palace.

[Question] In the course of your contacts with the Afghan working people have you noticed any changes in them?

[Answer] Definitely. Considerable changes have taken place in people, in ordinary Afghan working people who are becoming the masters of their country. For instance, the workers and office employees of the Junkalak automobile repair plant, the house-building complex and mechanized bakery in Kabul and the textile mill in Bagram not only regularly fulfil and overfulfil their production assignments, but also protect their enterprises round-the-clock from possible attacks by counterrevolutionary bands. In this country Friday is the day off. But the workers of these enterprises often come to work even on Fridays. Hashars, days of volunteer work somewhat similar to your subbotniks, are being increasingly practised in this country. Thanks to them schools and bridges have been repaired, streets cleaned, a hospital constructed in Balkh Province and dozens of homes built for the families of those who fell for the revolution. Out of the money earned during hashars these families were given material assistance amounting to more than 500,000 afghani. These few examples are evidence of the changes in our people, who are displaying a new attitude to work, to their people's state.

[Question] Frequently you meet with Afghan ulema. Don't they complain that the new regime is ignoring the country's religious specificities?

[Answer] Such contentions of Western propaganda are totally false and cause revulsion among our ulema, well-educated theologians, with whom I meet. Recently I went to the Ministry for Islamic Affairs and Waqfs and spoke to officials there. They had no complaints, only requests and suggestions. When on business trips, I visit mosques and talk to members of the congregations. We do everything to ensure the best conditions for the observance of religious rites.

The leaders of the counterrevolution use every opportunity to make shrill statements that they are sending "fighters for the faith" to battle for the "sacred Koran," which supposedly is in danger. These incantations are aimed at illiterate and ignorant people. A part of the population still falls for the exhortations of the counterrevolutionaries and Western propaganda, but this is mainly due to ignorance and backwardness. These people were downtrodden in the past and this tells. But more and more of our Muslims, when they learn what we are doing for them, are beginning to see the light. During the past five years 231 mosques were built and 1,026 repaired, with 270 million afghani of state funds spent on that. During the same period counterrevolutionary bands of "fighters for the faith" destroyed 254 mosques. During this time more than 25,000 Muslims went on pilgrimages to Mecca with state assistance. The state spent an average of 26,600 afghani on each pilgrim, a total of 726 million. Quite a large sum, as I'm sure you will agree. [paragraph continues]

The DRA government pays the salaries of 11,570 mullahs in 5,167 mosques. The state finances the theological department of Kabul University and 20 madrasahs (religious schools). Preparations for the opening of the Islamic Institute are in full swing in Kabul. As you see, genuine concern is shown for the needs of Muslims, but it is still being stubbornly claimed that we are oppressing somebody.

The social status of the overwhelming majority of the Muslim clergy in Afghanistan is close to that of the working population. That is why they are interested in ensuring social justice and in improving the working people's living conditions. The patriotic section of the clergy is actively joining the socioeconomic transformations, supporting the aims and tasks of the national-democratic revolution and taking part in the work of the executive branches of state administration and public organizations.

[Question] The PDPA and the government are directing their efforts at overcoming economic and social backwardness. In March of this year Afghanistan started fulfilling a five-year plan. What place does this hold in the solution of these problems?

[Answer] Despite the undeclared war unleashed against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the unceasing armed incursions by groups of bandits we are doing everything possible to develop the economy and improve the population's life. The five-year plan pursues precisely these aims. It provides for an accelerated development of the key branches of the national economy and raising the material and cultural standards of the people's life. We have worked out a programme for drawing local businessmen into economic development. By the end of the five-year period, we estimate, national income will have grown by 25 per cent, industrial output by 38 per cent and gross agricultural output by 14-16 per cent.

Though its fulfilment will require considerable effort, it is a realistic plan. I can say already that we have made a good start. For the first time all the industrial ministries are successfully coping with their assignments. The six-month plan of industrial output in the public and mixed sectors was fulfilled by 110.8 per cent. The private industrial sector is operating well. There are changes for the better in agriculture. New irrigated areas have been put to use and the state is giving effective assistance to peasants by providing them with credits, seeds and fertilizers.

The social sphere is being further developed. We are building new schools and hospitals, the enrolment of children in elementary schools is gradually growing as well as of students in establishments of higher and secondary education. We regard the economic front as being as important as the military one.

[Question] The nomads were always considered the most deprived part of the Afghan population. During my trips to Paktia, Nangarhar, Qandahar, Zabol and other provinces I saw numerous tent settlements serving as temporary camps for nomads. Will these nomads be encouraged to switch to a settled way of life? If so, how?

[Answer] The Ghilzai, Durrani and some other tribes lead a nomadic way of life. They are all citizens of our republic for whom we must show concern. Eventually they will all become permanently settled. The development of socially backward areas where national minorities and nomads live will be accelerated, and these people will be ensured, on a just basis, their proper representation in the central and local state and public bodies, in the National Fatherland Front.

[Question] Late last August in Jalalabad you said in a speech, "We do not need war, enough! We must achieve accord, and respect mutual interests." With whom and on what basis is this accord to be achieved?

[Answer] Among the pressing tasks of our policy we include the creation of such conditions throughout the country in which outstanding issues could be solved jointly, peacefully, without the use of arms, in an atmosphere of trust, cooperation and brotherhood, on the basis of ensuring national interests and national accord. Our policy, directed at expanding the revolution's social base, and our new approach to these matters, imply a readiness for broad cooperation on a national scale in the interests of the entire people. This readiness presupposes:

The inclusion in the leading state bodies, i.e., the Revolutionary Council and the Council of Ministers, of non-party people who command respect and express the interests of various sections and groups of the population; The broadening of dialogue with those groups that from a lack of understanding still hold hostile positions to the revolution but may be expected to repent their anti-national counterrevolutionary activities; The possibility of flexible compromises on a principled basis in the name of national accord, establishing peace in the country and ensuring its security.

We call on all our countrymen to take an active part in the country's historic renewal and national rebirth. The arms of the motherland are open to all countrymen who are abroad. In conditions of guaranteed security, respect for human dignity and absence of discrimination we will give them an opportunity to join the cause of building a flourishing independent Afghanistan.

[Question] Does any basis exist for settling relations with Pakistan?

[Answer] We live with the people of Pakistan in one region and wish to live in peace, to cooperate in the struggle against backwardness, for social and economic progress. History made us neighbours and neighbours should live peacefully, should not shoot at each other.

Afghanistan has never interfered in the internal affairs of other countries, including the internal affairs of Pakistan. We have always been opponents of such interference. But it should be noted that Pakistan has become a springboard of the undeclared war against the DRA unleashed by the forces of imperialism and reaction headed by the United States. Every sensible person cannot fail to understand that such subversive activites damage both the Afghan and the Pakistani people. The peoples of our countries can benefit only from relations of good-neighbourliness and mutual respect.

I think there are no obstacles to improved relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan, to our cooperation. The government of Pakistan should finally head the will of its own people and stop serving as an accomplice in carrying out Washington's perfidious plans. We would like once again to draw the attention of the Pakistani authorities to the well-intended initiatives of the DRA, to the important step taken by the Soviet Union, which has just withdrawn six regiments of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in the country.

[Question] I am interviewing you on the day when the last of these six Soviet regiments is leaving Afghan territory. Do you think this measure is enough to stimulate a political settlement in the region?

[Answer] Speaking in Konduz at the send-off ceremony for a motorized infantry regiment, I said that this withdrawal was a step of good will that should become a new impulse for scaling down the undeclared war and stopping the aggression conducted from abroad. We hope that those who organize and carry out the armed intervention against us will appreciate this step. But they should also know that if this intervention continues our great friend, the Soviet Union, will not fail us in our time of need.

[Question] I thank you, Comrade Najibullah, for finding the time to give such detailed answers to my magazine's questions. Soon my country will be celebrating the 69th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. What would you like to say to he Soviet people through NEW TIMES on the eve of this holiday?

[Answer] Our friendship with the Soviet Union is as eternal as the world we live in. It is vivifying as a stream of water. Years and decades will pass, our children and grandchildren will grow up and carry further the pure banner of friendship between our countries. We will always remember what the Soviet Union has done for our democratic republic, indeed, for all of us.

On the eve of the anniversary of the Great October Revolution, which opened a new era in the history of mankind, I convey on behalf of the entire Afghan people wishes of happiness and prosperity to our great friend — the people of the land of Lenin.

DRA MEDICS CLAIM 'BANDITS' USE CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD171409 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Kabul November 17 TASS — "The AP agency report on the death in Kabul's military hospital Wazir Akbar Khan of two officers and five soldiers, who by some accident were exposed to poison gases used by Soviet troops, is an utter lie," said Major General of the Medical Service Dr. Wilayat Habib, superintendent of that hospital. "No patients suffering from the effects of chemical agents were enlisted at the hospital from September to October. Neither the Soviet, nor the Afghan troops in Afghanistan have chemical weapons, and have never used them. Chemical weapons are used in Afghanistan only by counter-revolutionary bandits," he said in an interview with a correspondent of the NOVOSTI Press Agency.

A statement to the same effect has been made by leading surgeon of a civil hospital Wazir Akbar Khan, Munawar Khaled. He said: Neither in September nor in October people suffering from toxic chemicals came to us. Yet, still undergoing a course of treatment at our hospital, are two patients — shepherd Shaista Khan from Ghazni and peasant Amin Jan from Pakitia who came to us in the summer of this year. Both suffered as a result of the use of chemical weapons by the bandits. But their life is not in danger. Unfortunately, a year ago we failed to save the lives of four people who were badly injured by chemical agents supplied by the CIA to the counter-revolutionaries.

SHEVARDNADZE, BULGARIAN ENVOY HOLD 'WARM' TALK

LD182134 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1758 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign afiairs, today received Georgi Pankov, member of the BCP Central Committee and Bulgarian ambassador to the USSR.

During the course of a warm and friendly converstion, satisfaction was expressed at the dynamic development of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation. The determining role of the meetings and conversations between Mikhail Gorbachev and Todor Zhivkov for the further deepening of Soviet-Bulgarian relations was noted. The course toward the acceleration of socioeconomic development, worked out at the 27th CPSU Congress, and the decisions of the 13th BCP Congress ensure favorable conditions for all-round interaction between the USSR and Bulgaria.

Profound satisfaction was expressed at the results of the working meeting in Moscow of the leaders of the fraternal parties of the socialist member-countries of CEMA, which is of exceptionally important significance for the development and perfection of cooperation and a more complete exposure of the creative potential of socialism.

The necessity of increasing efforts in reinforcing the boundaries [po zakrepleniyu rubezhey] on the path to nuclear disarmament which were achieved at Reykjavik was stressed. It was pointed out in this regard that the complex of Soviet initiatives remains in force and forms a platform which offers a historic chance for a fundamental solution to the problems of war and peace.

Georgi Pankov noted that the government and people of Bulgaria fully support the USSR's energetic foreign policy and the major Soviet foreign policy initiatives aimed at strengthening peace and general security, to halt the arms race, and prohibiting nuclear and space weapons.

Bulgaria's constructive activity in the international arena, which is a significant contribution to the common cause of struggle for peace and international security, was highly assessed.

In conclusion Eduard Shevardnadze wished the ambassador success in his reponsible work in further strengthening Soviet-Bulgarian friendship and increasing the efficacy of our cooperation.

BRIEFS

BULGARIAN PRODUCTION ASSOCIATION -- A joint Soviet-Bulgarian scientific production association, Ivanovo-Sofia, has been set up in accordance with the comprehensive program of the CEMA countries. It will develop various types of machine tools. [Summary] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0001 GMT 11 Nov 86 LD]

TASS CRITIZES REMARKS BY NORWEGIAN COMMANDER

LD181919 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The discussion of problems of establishing a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe is an integral part of the efforts to reduce the nuclear arsenals on the continent and a step towards the complete eradication of nuclear weapons.

Quite naturally, all who are interested in strengthening peace in northern Europe have positively assessed the USSR's latest initiatives announced in Helsinki by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

They were, first of all, a concrete confirmation of the Soviet Union's readiness to consider substantial measures with regard to its own territory adjoining the would-be non-nuclear zone.

Secondly, they were a practical support for the idea of possible confidence-building measures in respect to the northern region and the adjacent seas.

There are, however, certain quarters in Scandinavia which did not like the Soviet initiatives. For instance, the commander-in-chief of the Norwegian Armed Forces, General Fredrik Bull-Hansen, tried to reduce their impact on public opinion in an interview with the newspaper AFTENPOSTEN.

He said he doubted that the USSR had really dismantled the medium-range missile launchers in the Kola Peninsula and a large part of such launchers in the rest of the territory of the Leningrad and the Baltic military districts.

What was happening in reality, the general claimed, was the replacement by the Soviet Union of the outdated SS-5 missiles with new SS-20's.

Does Bull-Hansen have a reliable source of information? Far from that. He merely repeats the obvious lie concocted by a certain Tomas Rais, a self-proclaimed "Finnish expert on Soviet arms in northern Europe."

Rais assumed the title on the strength of the fact that his mother was born in Finland (but long since left that country).

Why has the Norwegian general picked up the hoax? Is he not one of those who, in a bid to thwart the process of nuclear disarmament, started claiming after Reykjavik that nuclear weapons are a good thing?

The British newspaper OBSERVER meant precisely such generals, when it said that they felt more comfortable with nuclear arms, while the renunciation of nuclear arsenals was tantamount to the threats to strip them down to their underwear.

The commander-in-chief should recall the latest statement by Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland that the current Norwegian Government, like the previous ones, regarded the development of relations with the neighbouring Soviet Union as an important goal.

The general's lie can hardly correspond to the Norwegian Government's policy.

ISLAMIC CONFERENCE SECRETARY GENERAL RECEIVED

Talks With Kapitsa 15 Nov

LD151420 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- There was a conversation at the USSR Foreign Ministry today between USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Mikhail Kapitsa and Secretary-General of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference Sayid Sharaf al-Din Pirzada, now on a brief working visit in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Government. The conversation passed in a businesslike astmosphere. USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov gave a luncheon in honour of Sharaf al-Din Pirzada on November 14. Yuliy Vorontsov and Sharaf al-Din Prizada exchanged speeches.

Shevardnadze-Pirzada Talks

PM171423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

["Conversations in the USSR Foreign Ministry" — IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, has met and talked on 14 November with Sharaf al-Din Pirzada, secretary general of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, who is currently on a brief working visit in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The conversation covered a broad range of issues pertaining to the present-day international situation.

The guest's attention was drawn to the Soviet Union's persistent efforts aimed at ridding mankind speedily and completely of the nuclear threat, strengthening mutual understanding, cooperation and trust among nations, and creating an all-embracing international security system.

Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that, thanks to the Soviet side's initiative, advances toward historical frontiers along the path toward nuclear disarmament were made at the Reykjavik meeting of the USSR and U.S. leaders.

Today the task of all states, movements, public organizations, and individual political figures is to consolidate these advances and contribute towards further progress on the issue of disarmament and on strengthening peace. To that end it is necessary to overcome the ambition of the USA to put into outer space the latest types of dangerous weapons under the pretext of creating a "defense" SDI system.

The pressing need was stressed by both sides for reaching through collective efforts a just and all-embracing settlement of the Near East conflict, at whose heart is the Palestinian problem. It was pointed out that putting an end as soon as possible to the senseless Iran-Iraq war and a political settlement of the conflict would accord with the interests of both countries and contribute to an improvement of the international situation as a whole.

In examining the situation around Afghanistan, Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that the return home from that country of six Soviet regiments is a manifestation of the Soviet Union's goodwill, its constructive contribution to a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. Further steps in that direction will depend on whether an end is put to armed interference in the home affairs of the Afghan people or not. Sharaf al-Din Pirzada showed interest in new elements in the field of settlement around Afghanistan.

The secretary general of the Organization of the Islamic Conference spoke about the organization's activities, expressed sincere gratitude for the warm reception accorded to him in Moscow, and declared support for continuing contacts.

Pirzada Departs Moscow 16 Nov

LD161245 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS — Sayid Sharaf al-Din Pirzada, general secretary of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, today departed from Moscow. He was staying in the USSR on a short working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

GEN IVANOVSKIY RETURNS FROM SYRIA 15 NOV

PM181245 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Completed"]

[Text] On 15 November of this year Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who was in Syria on an official visit, returned to Moscow.

Colonel General D.A. Grinkevich, Colonel General B.P. Ivanov, and other generals and officers met Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy at the airport.

MOLDAVIAN OFFICIAL, DELEGATION RECEIVED IN IRAQ

LD171909 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Taha Yasin Ramadan, Iraqi first deputy prime minister, received a delegation of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, led by the first deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers, who are currently visiting Iraq. During the talks the importance of extending cooperation between the social and vocational societies in the Soviet Union and Iraq was pointed out, in order to strengthen the amiable relations between the Soviet and Iraqi peoples.

PRAVDA CARRIES ANNIVERSARY MESSAGE TO ANGOLA

PM111419 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 86 First Edition p 1

[USSR leadership bodies' message to Angolan president on independence anniversary]

[Text] To Comrade Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-labor Party [MPLA-PT] and president of the People's Republic of Angola

We warmly congratulate you, the MPLA-PT Central Committee, the Standing Commission of the National People's Assembly, the Angolan Government, and the entire Angolan people on the occasion of National Day — the 11th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the People's Republic of Angola.

Having won the struggle for independence, the Angolan patriots, led by their vanguard, the MPLA-PT, made a sovereign choice and proclaimed the building of a new society in keeping with the aspirations of the entire people as their aim.

In our time the ability to live and work in an atmosphere of lasting peace is an indispensable precondition for the successful implementation by peoples of their creative plans for socioeconomic development and increasing prosperity. However, imperialist circles are still yearning for their former supremacy and are still trying to implement their hegemonist schemes. This is why the Soviet Union, the other socialist states, and all people who treasure progress and the peoples' well-being now see no more important task than preserving peace and creating to this end a universal system of international security meeting the interests of all states, large and small, without exception.

We highly value Angola's active struggle for peace and against the aggressive imperialist policy, colonialism, and racism. The Angolan people know well what war is like. Even today, 11 years after achieving independence, they have to defend with weapon in hand their sacred right to development along their chosen path.

Soviet people express their solidarity with the courageous Angolan people, who are defending their revolutionary gains against the encroachments of external and internal enemies in the shape of the military of the racist Republic of South Africa and its hirelings. Loyal to its policy of friendship with Angola, the Soviet Union will continue to do all in its power to ensure that Soviet-Angolan relations, which have a reliable basis in the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between our countries, strengthen with every passing day.

We wish the Angolan working people and their leadership much success in peaceful building, the strengthening of the country's defense capability, and the achievement of the aims set by the Second MPLA-PT Congress.

CPSU Central Committee

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON SUPREME SOVIET SESSION

IZVESTIYA on 17 Nov Session

PM181418 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 5

[Unattributed "Information Report on the Sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, began in Moscow on 17 November 1986.

The first joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities took place in the Great Kremlin Palace at 1000 hours. A.E. Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, was in the chair.

Following a proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, approved by the chambers' Councils of Elders, the USSR Supreme Soviet approved the agenda and order to work for the session.

The following questions were included on the agenda:

1. The State Plant for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1987 and progress in fulfilling the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986.

2. The USSR State Budget for 1987 and the fulfillment of the USSR State Budget in 1985.

3. The activity of the USSR People's Control Committee.

4. The draft USSR Law on Individual Labor Activity.

5. The ratification of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees.

The USSR Supreme Soviet heard a report from Deputy N.V. Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Develpment of the USSR for 1987 and progress in fulfilling the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986, and a report from Deputy B.I. Gostev, USSR minister of finance, on the USSR State Budget for 1987 and the fulfillment of the USSR State Budget in 1985.

Deputy G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Deputy S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, then spoke.

The first session of the Soviet of the Union took place at 1400 hours in the hall of sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers. L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, was in the chair.

The deputies and guests rose to honor the memory of the late Deputy A.G. Petrishchev.

The Soviet of the Union heard a report from K.S. Demirchyan, chairman of the Credentials Commission, on the checking of the credentials of deputies elected since the USSR Supreme Soviet's fifth session to replace departed deputies. The Soviet of the Union resolved to recognize the credentials of the following deputies: V.A. Kuptsov, elected for Velikoustyugskiy Electoral Okrug No. 140 in Vologda Oblast; V.V. Bakatin, elected for Sovetskiy Electoral Okrug No. 196 in Kirov Oblast; Ye. S. Storoyev, elected for Livenskiy Electoral Okrug No. 248 in Orel Oblast; Yu. I. Litvintsev, elected for Shchekinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 319 in Tula Oblast; V.I. Mironenko, elected for Losovskiy Electoral Okrug No. 529 in Kharkov Oblast, Ukrainian SSR; M.M. Aripdzhanov, elected for Izbaskanskiy Electoral Okrug No. 579 in Andizhan Oblast, Uzbek SSR; V.V. Dementsev, elected for Karshinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 586 in Kashka-Darya Oblast, Uzbek SSR; A.S. Yefimov, elected for Navoiyskiy Electoral Okrug No. 588 in Navoi Oblast, Uzbek SSR; G.A. Yagodin, elected for Bukinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 605 in Tashkent Oblast, Uzbek SSR; Yu.N. Trofimov, elected for Aktyubinskiy Rural Electoral Okrug No. 623 in Aktyubinsk Oblast, Kazakh SSR; A.A. Kulibayev, elected for Guryevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 627 in Guryev Oblast, Kazakh SSR; L.B. Vasilyev, elected for Sametredskiy Electoral Okrug No. 670 in the Georgian SSR; V.A. Bykov, elected for Kanibadamskiy Electoral Okrug No. 726 in the Tajik SSR; Yu.A. Belyakov, elected for Volgogradskiy Electoral Okrug No. 5 in Moscow City; L.V. Sharin, elected for Belogorskiy Electoral Okrug No. 108 in Amur Oblast; F.A. Tabeyev, elected for Rzhevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 178 in Kalinin Oblast; N.S. Yermakov, elected for Ordzhonikidzevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 188 in Kemerovo Oblast; A.N. Plekhanov, elected for Lebyazhyevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 210 in Kurgan Oblast; P.A. Smolskiy, elected for Sasovskiy Electoral Okrug No. 281 in Ryazan Oblast; Yu.V. Petrov, elected for Kushvinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 301 in Sverdlovsk Oblast; A.S. Syatsov, elected for Leninskiy Electoral Okrug No. 382 in the Tatar ASSR; A.P. Sazonov, elected for Vasilyevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 460 in Zaporozhye Oblast, Ukrainian SSR; G.I. Revenko, elected for Belotserkovskiy Electoral Okrug No. 472 in Kiev Oblast, Ukrainian SSR; V.G. Anufriyev, elected for Taldy-Kurganskiy Rural Electoral Okrug No. 648 in Taldy-Kurgan Oblast, Kazakh SSR; Yu.A. Sklyarov, elected for Rybnitskiy Electoral Okrug No. 703 in the Moldavian SSR; and Yu.P. Kochetkov, elected for Sevanskiy Electoral Okrug No. 738 in the Armenian SSR.

In connection with his appointment as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Deputy V.K. Gusev was released from his duties as chairman of the Consumer Goods and Services to the Population Commission.

The Soviet of the Union elected Deputy F.A. Tabeyev chairman of that commission.

Other changes were also made to the composition of standing commissions of the chamber.

The subsidiary report of the Plan and Budget and other standing commissions on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1987 and progress in fulfilling the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986, on the USSR State Budget for 1987, and on the fulfillment of the USSR State Budget in 1985 was then delivered by V.A. Masol, chairman of the Plan and Budget Commission.

The following deputies spoke in the debates on these questions: F.A. Tabeyev, A.P. Lyashko, K.M. Bagirov, L.P. Shurybina, V.G. Klyuyev, and T.A. Alimov.

The session is continuing.

Soviet of Union Session

LD181358 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1315 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Hello comrades! In a previous news bulletin we already said that the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued its work in the Kremlin today at separate sessions of the chambers, and that at 1000, the second session of the Soviet of Nationalities opened.

Now another report has come from the Kremlin: The second session of the Soviet of the Union began today at 1500. The deputies and guests greeted with applause Comrade Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Slyunkov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Medvedev, and Razumovskiy.

Deputies Discuss Socioeconomics

LD181628 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Two hours ago in the Kremlin the second session of the Soviet of the Union — one of the chambers of the highest organ of state power in the country — opened. The deputies and visitors applauded Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Slyunkov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Medvedev, and Razumovskiy.

Now the deputies are continuing their discussion of the draft plans for the socioeconomic development of the country and its budget for 1987. They stress that the coming year will be of great significance in the development of the national economy, since it will be precisely in the second year of the 5-year plan that the new methods of socialist management will become widely employed. This has been fully reflected in the draft program for the socioeconomic development of the USSR.

The participants in the debate in the Soviet of the Union — and they included Comrade Alimov, first secretary of the Tashkent Oblast Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan; (Kuleshov), general director of the Minsk Tractor Works Association; (Klepikov), a brigade leader from the Krasnodar Kuban collective farms; and others — introduced proposals to approve the draft plan and the budget of the country for 1987. Similar proposals were introduced today during debates in the other chamber of the Supreme Soviet — the Soviet of Nationalities.

Budget Debate Continues

LD181626 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — The deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet (Parliament) today continued the debate on the drafts of the state plan of the economic and social development and the budget of the USSR for 1987 in separate sessions of the chambers.

The deputies pointed out that the tentative results of the current year show that the national economy was developing at higher rates than those recorded last year. The plan for the next year also projects high targets.

For instance, the national income will go up by over four per cent. The deputies suggested approving the drafts of the country's plan and budget.

The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work on Wednesday.

Budget Debate Ends

LD181316 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpt] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Our correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy presents a report from the Kremlin:

[Ruvinskiy] The debate on next year's plan and budget ended half an hour ago in one of the chambers — the Soviet of Nationalities. In that debate 22 deputies participated, representing all the union republics and a number of autonomous republics. When the Supreme Soviet conducts its work in separate chambers in this way, this gives the opportunity for taking into account the interests of and raising problems of each union republic separately, as well as those touching on sectors of the economy or education, culture or health care affecting the country as a whole.

So what, for instance, are characteristic features for Belorussia? Here it is planned to increase machine-tool and instrument building; there is to be an increase in output of machine tools with numerical program control. In Moldavia there is to be an increase in the capacity of the agro-industrial complex, including in the output of juices and fruit or vegetable conserves. Among the most important tasks for Kazakhstan, as before, are those of increasing grain production and developing sheep farming. For the republics of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus, the plan looks to the work-capable population being drawn more fully into public sector production.

And so the deputies have primarily discussed how to tackle all these matters. A characteristic feature has been the fact that every intervention has included pointed and principled reference to the importance of the quality of work and output.

There is now an interval in the work of the session, and preparations are under way for a sitting of the Soviet of the Union.

Results To Be Summarized

LD181940 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] The deputies of both chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet session continued their discussion of the draft plan for the country's socioeconomic development and its budget for 1987. They stressed that to improve the operation at all levels of the national economy and strengthen the role of labor collectives restructuring must be carried out more decisively. [passage omitted] Many of the deputies commented that a thoughtful attitude to the technical level and quality of output is now demanded of every worker. [passage omitted] In analyzing the country's plan and budget for next year, the participants at the session pointed out their social orientation. [passage omitted]

The debates on the draft plan for the country's socioeconomic development and its draft budget for 1987 were completed at today's session. The results of the debates will be summed up tomorrow at a joint session of both chambers. In addition, the deputies are to examine questions relating to the activities of the USSR People's Control Committee; to the USSR bill on individual labor activity; and to ratification of decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Session Hears Criticism

LD181634 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] The USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing a session in Moscow. [passage omitted] The deputies have been speaking favorably about the planned high rates of the nation's development and the program's emphasis on social progress. There's been strong criticism however of low quality still existing in production, of bureaucracy and mismanagement which are yet to be uprooted and substandard technical equipment of some enterprises. The minister of the woodworking industry, Mikhail Busygin, admitted that many makes of furniture and country cottages were finding no demand on the market. His industry is now restructuring its work so that all of its produce would be up to the best world standards.

The Education Ministry and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences came in for criticism from Venera Mamedova, a teacher in Azerbaijan. She blamed the agencies for the shortage of new textbooks and teachers of a new subject, the rudiments of computer science. Many of the deputies have contributed proposals aimed at improving education, health care and retail trade.

TASS Reports Culture Speeches

LD181327 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- A TASS correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

Deputies at the current session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR speak not only of projects for the economic and social development of their country but also changes in the culture field.

Deputy Vladimir Karpov, first secretary of the Board of the Writers' Union, said specifically: The writers' organisation orients its members towards reflecting new tendencies in the life of Soviet society, specifically, in its cultural life.

After the 27th Congress of the CPSU we talk and write much about our shortcomings. Reading about such things often makes one bitter and sad, but we must tell the truth, Karpov went on. It has a cleansing effect, frees the writer of his old feeling of being restricted by some "rules" which forbid him to touch certain themes. There are no such things today.

But to write of shortcomings only is incomplete truth. The full truth today is that shortcomings should be given a principled assessment and that struggle is going on to overcome stagnation both in the economic and cultural fields. That is what we must write about today if we are to reflect the truth of life.

This writer was not the only one who spoke of changes in the cultural field at the current Supreme Soviet session. Mirab Berdzenishvili, sculptor from Georgia, spoke at the session of the need to produce more talented monuments glorifying the working man. The language of sculpture, he said, lives through the centuries. It is thanks to the art of sculpture that we know today what prehistoric Egyptians and ancient Greeks looked like.

I was gladdened as an artist by the fact that the draft plan for the next year reflects increased attention to the improvement of the cultural life of Soviet society.

Changes in the minds of people should be started when they are still in school, said Deputy Venera Mamedova, country school teacher from Azerbaijan (Transcaucasia). We are trying to bring it home to our pupils that great positive changes are now taking place in our life and that these changes stimulate initiative and creativity. This is an important part of our work under the school reform which is being carried out in the USSR.

TV Lists Speakers

LD181845 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Good evening, comrades! Today in Moscow, the sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation is continuing its work at separate sittings of the chambers. At 1000 the second sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities opened in the session hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [video shows several brief panshots of the audience, then dwells on the center of the presidium, where sitting in the upper row are Sokolov and Nikonov, in the second row left to right are Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Biryukova, and Dobrynin, in the lower row are three unidentified deputies. Further clips of the audience reveal Marshals of the Soviet Union Kulikov and Ogarkov]

Taking part in the meeting are Comrades Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Sokolov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, and Nikonov. Speaking in the debates on the country's plan and budget for the next year were: Deputy Nazirov, operator of the Fergananefteorgsintex Production Association; Deputy Tatarchuk, first secretary of the Kalinin obkom; Deputy Berdzenishvili, sculptor from Georgia; Deputy Mamedova, a teacher of the Sadarak village secondary school in the Azerbaijan SSR; Deputy Busygin, USSR minister of timber, pulp and paper and wood processing industry; Deputy Kiselev, second secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee; Deputy Bolshakov, general director of the Moldavian Tochlibmash Production Association; Deputy Ipyatis, computer maintenance engineer of the Ventspils staging oil base of the Latvian SSR; Deputy Ambartsumyan, rector of Yerevan state university; Deputy Galiyev, chairman of the (Unysh) kolkhoz of the Bashkirian ASSR: Deputy Mitrin, first secretary of the Krasnovodsk obkom of Turkmen Communist Party; Deputy Rakhmonov, assembly workers' team leader of the 33d construction directorate of the Tadzhikkhimstroy Trust; Deputy Ovsyannikova, deputy chief doctor of a rayon hospital in the Khanty-Mansi autonomous okrug; Deputy Pedok, chairman of the Estonian republican trade union congress; Deputy Lyabushev, chief agricultural engineer of the Red Banner kolkhoz of the Mordovian ASSR. [video shows all listed speakers]

The sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities has ended.

Leadership Evening Session

LD182259 Moscow Televsion Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report]

[Text] This evening the second session of the Soviet of the Union opened in the session hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers.

The deputies and guests met with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Slyunkov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Medvedev and Razumovskiy. [video shows presidium taking seats — back row: Solovyev, Slyunkov, Medvedev; third row: Razumovskiy, Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Kunayev, Talyzin, Dolgikh; second row: Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Gromyko, Gorbachev, Aliyev, Demichev; front row: Grishyavichus, Kulova, Tolkunov, (?Narmatova), Paton]

The following spoke in the discussion of matters relating to the state plan and country's budget for 1986: Deputy Kuleshov, general director of the Minsk Lenin Tractor Works Production Association; Deputy Klepikov, team leader of composite team of the Kuban kolkhoz, Krasnodar Kray; Deputy Kulibayev, first secretary of Guryev Obkom of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan; deputy Cherkeziya, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR; Deputy Aksamitauskene, weaver at the Kaunus Drobe Production Association; deputy Makhkamov, first secretary of the communist party of Tajikistan Central Committee; Deputy Mokanu, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Moldavian SSR; Deputy Sabirov, fitter and assembly team leader of the Naryngidroenergostroy Construction Administration, Kirgiz SSR; Deputy Popov, first secretary of Altay Kraykom; deputy Liyeberg, chairman of the 9 May kolkhoz, Estonian SSR; Deputy Logachev, chairman of the presidium of the Eastern Siberian branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department; Deputy Markaryan, plastering team leader of the Yerpromstroy Trust Building Administration of the Armenian SSR; Deputy Nurgilbiyev, metal worker at the Lenin Locomotive Depot at Ashkhabad Station, Turkmen SSR; Deputy Trofimova, crane operator at the Maritime Kray Primorremrybflot Production and Ship Repair Association; Deputy Pogodin, chairman of the Executive committee of the Kuybyshev Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies; and Deputy Lebedeva, head of department at the Ordzhonikidze Sanatorium, Kislovodsk, Stavropol Kray.

On 19 November the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work. [video shows each speaker at rostrum, brief cuts to audience and panorama shots of platform]

Third Day Agenda

LD190427 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation will resume its work today in the great Kremlin palace. Those taking part in the session are to sum up the results of the discussion of the drafts of the plan for the country's social and economic development, and its budget, for 1987. Also, according to the agenda, they will have to examine another three questions: the activity of the People's Control Committee, the draft law on individual labor activity, and confirmation of decrees of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Soviets Hold Joint Session

LD190622 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0304 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Excerpts] Today is the third day of the work of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. A joint session of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet Nationalities will open at 1000 in the morning in the meeting hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Great Kremlin Palace. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev, Sokolov Attend

LD190916 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0800 GMT 19 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation continued its work in Moscow today in the Great Kremlin Palace, at a joint session of the chambers. Delegates and guests greeted with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Virotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Sylunkov, Sokolov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Medvedev, Nikonov, Razumovskiy, and Kapitonov. The session was chaired by deputy Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union.

The final speech on the state plan for the country's economic and social development for 1987 and on the implementation of the 1986 plan was delivered by Deputy Talyzin first deputy chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Gosplan.

In separate voting by chamber, the deputies unanimously adopted the law on the state plan for the country's development for next year, and a resolution on how fulfillment of the plan is proceeding in the current year. The final speech on the country's state budget for 1987 and on implementation of the budget for 1985 was delivered by Comrade Gostev, USSR minister of finance.

The session continues its work. [video shows long shot of platform, deputies standing and applauding. Gorbachev enters along back of platform and stands at his seat, center left in second row back, applauding. Various shots of left side of platform shown on screen from left to right, front row: Lobacheva, Toliunov, Voss; second row: Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Gromyko, Gorbachev; third row: Chebrikov, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Zaykov and Solomentsev; fourth row: Talyzin, Demichev, Dolgikh. Taylyzin shown speaking at rostrum with Atanov visible over his shoulder on right of platform, apparently asleep. Gostev shown speaking at rostrum.]

Budget, Plan Approved

LD190743 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 19 (TASS) -- Today the USSR Supreme Soviet endorsed the country's socio-economic development plan and budget for 1987.

National income is to grow by 4.1 per cent. This will exceed the planned target for 1986.

Three quarters of national income increment will used to raise the living standard of the people.

The population's real incomes will grow by more than 2.5 per cent within the year.

The USSR's budget for next year is also notable for greater social directedness. For example, appropriations for social and cultural activities will amount to 140,000 million roubles. That will be approximately a third of the budget.

The share of defence expenditures in the budget of the USSR is kept at this year's level -- 4.6 per cent.

ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT COMMISSION HOLDS SESSION

PM281623 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No. 43, Oct 86 (Signed to Press 16 Oct 86) p 7

[Unattributed report: "In the Commission for the Improvement of Management, Planning, and the Economic Mechanism"]

[Text] At its regular sessions, the Commission for the Improvement of Management, Planning, and the Economic Machinery, which was set up by a USSR Council of Ministers decree, examined questions of transferring enterprises belonging to several ministries, including railroads under the Ministry of Railways, machine bulding production associations (enterprises) under the Ministry of the Coal Industry, construction industry production associations (enterprises) under the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, scientific institutions and organizations, and science-and-production associations to new conditions of economic management, and also questions of transferring scientific research and technology organizations belonging to science-and-production and production associations to complete financial autonomy and self-financing.

The transfer of associations (enterprises) and organizations belonging to the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Consumer Services to self-financing and distribution of earnings according to the residual gross income method was examined and basically approved, as was the transfer of the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet and its constituent shipping lines and enterprises engaged in basic operational activity to complete financial autonomy.

The results of the experiment conducted in the Belorussian SSR to reduce the resource-intensiveness of construction work were discussed. It was noted that the experiment confirmed the great economic benefit of its conditions and stipulations, which ensure the reduction of the resource-intensiveness of construction work through accelerating the pace of the introduction of scientific and technical progress and advanced experience. Stabilization of the estimated costs of construction and installation work has been achieved there in parallel with reductions in labor and material expenditure. Additions and amendments to the methodological principles for conducting this experiment were made on the basis of a generalization of accumulated experience.

It was decided to extend the conditions of the experiment conducted in the Belorussian SSR to reduce the resource-intensiveness of construction work to the Moscow Gorispolkom's Moscow City Main Administration for the Construction of Engineering Installations.

Questions concerning the enhanced responsibility of economic leadership organs and of supply and sales, transportation, and other organizations for ensuring steady and stable work by all components of the national economy were examined, as were measures to liquidate loss-making in the national economy.

The results of selective inspection of the practical introduction of individual provisions of the new economic machinery were discussed.

A report was heard from the USSR Ministry of Light Industry regarding the preparation of enterprises for transfer to new conditions of economic management. The ministry's attention was drawn to the inadequate monitoring of the notification of methodological principles and normatives to enterprises and the lack of fundamental restructuring in the work of the ministry's central apparatus.

It was noted that the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry are unjustifiably delaying the coordination with the USSR Ministry of Light Industry of methodological principles for the organization and holding of trade fairs for the sale of basic raw and other materials and of regulations for material and technical supplies of raw and other materials to USSR Ministry of Light Industry enterprises.

The question of completing the transfer of USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy enterprises to new conditions of economic management as of 1 January 1987 was examined.

VORONIN ADDRESSES ECONOMIC SEMINAR FOR MINISTERS

PM140921 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Economic Cadres' Studies"]

[Text] A seminar for ministers and deputy ministers of union and union republic ministries and departments switching to the new management methods in 1987 has been held at the USSR Council of Ministers academy of the National Economy Institute for Raising the Qualifications of Leaders in the Top Link of State Management.

Questions of restructuring the system of economic management in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions, accelerating scientific and technical progress, improving the system of plan indicators and normatives, material and technical supplies, price formation, the organization of labor remuneration, and the management of capital construction, increasing the impact of the financial and credit mechanism on production efficiency, and switching to economic methods of leadership at all levels of the national economy were examined during the studies.

Great attention was devoted to the preparations for switching associations and enterprises to full financial autonomy and self-financing.

There was an exchange of experience on the preparations for switching to the new management methods, taking account of the practice of sectors, enterprises, and associations that were switched earlier to the new conditions of planning and economic incentives for labor collectives.

The seminar was addressed by V.P. Mozhin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Economic Section; L.A. Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gossnab; S.A. Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan; V.S. Pavlov, chairman of the USSR State Prices Committee; M.S. Zotov, chairman of the board of the USSR Bank for Financing Capital Investments; L.A. Bibin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosstroy; A.I. Milyukov, deputy chief of a section of the USSR Council of Ministers Administration of Affairs; L.A. Kostin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems; V.A. Salnikov, USSR deputy minister of finance; V.A. Pushnyan, deputy minister of instrument making, automation equipment, and control systems; and general directors of associations and enteprises.

NIKONOV, OTHERS MARK AGRICULTURAL WORKERS DAY

LD150446 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] A festive meeting devoted to the day of workers of agriculture and the processing industry of the agro-industrial complex took place on 14 November in Moscow in the state central concert hall. On the presidium were Comrade Nikonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; ministers of the USSR and of the RSFSR; chairmen of state committees; senior staff of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, ministries and departments; winners of socialist competition and production innovators; and scientists. A report was delivered by Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the country's State-Agro-Industrial Committee.

MINISTER PROMISES IMPROVED BREAD PRODUCTS

PM181301 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 November 1986 First Edition carries on page 4 under the headline "Thoughts About Bread" a 1,800-word TASS correspondent interview with G.S. Zolotukhin, USSR minister of bread products, commenting on readers' letters asking about planned developments in the bread-baking industry.

The minister is quoted as saying: "As of 1987, it is proposed to increase production of bread made from top-quality wheat flour and rye flour. USSR Bread Products Ministry enterprises will increase production of bread made from top-quality wheat flour 120 percent by 1990, and its production will already total at least 900,000 metric tons in 1987." And he continues: "During the current 5-year plan it is planned to construct, enlarge, or modernize 240 bread-baking enterprises in various parts of the country and to renew more than one-third of milling enterprise capacities. In the country as a whole it is proposed to more than double production of top-quality flour over the next few years."

Going on to speak about bread prices, the minister emphasizes that "the prices of existing types of bread will stay at the present level." However, he points out that "the bread-baking industry will start up production of new kinds of bread -- of higher quality, more tasty and aromatic, that do not go stale so quickly. For this the necessary additives will be needed, and some types of flour will need to be replaced by higher-quality flour." All this will cost money, reportedly more than R200 million, which will be reflected in the price of the new kinds of bread. However, the minister maintains that the additional cost to the consumer, given the same level of bread consumption, will be only of the order of 1 kopek a day.

SYR-DARYA OBLAST EXCEEDS AGRICULTURAL TARGETS

PM121129 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Nov 86 p 1

[Unnamed SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent report under the general heading: "The Motto Is Acceleration"]

[Text] Gulistan, 10 Nov -- The virgin land grain harvest has increased this year in Syr-Darya Oblast. For the first time crop farmers there have delivered 62,000 metric tons of grain to the state granaries and overfulfilled the plan. They also coped ahead of schedule with the yearly target for the sale of vegetables and potatoes. Some 63,000 metric tons of vegetables and 3,100 metric tons of potatoes have been dispatched to the procurement centers.